

# The Nation.

NEW YORK, THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 21, 1876.

## The Week.

MR. ADAMS has accepted the Democratic nomination in Massachusetts in a letter in which he speaks of the Convention simply as "a convention of voters," says he has never sought an office and never declined one, and if elected is willing to be useful wherever he can, and does not believe the present party in power likely either to reform the existing corruption and disorder in the Administration, or restore peace and prosperity at the South. He does not mention or allude to the Democratic party, or commit himself to any doctrine or policy, and as he now stands is perhaps as independent a candidate as ever was put up. The wailing over the nomination among the Republicans still continues. The professional politicians, of course, look on the selection of a first-class outsider by their opponents as downright cheating. They feel, therefore, very much as Bill Nye felt when, on sitting down to play a quiet, Christian game with Ah Sin, he found that "the heathen Chinese" had twenty-four packs in his sleeve. Of course, the answer to their talk is that Mr. Adams represents the Democrats just as well as Mr. Hayes represents the corrupt or Blaine wing of the Republicans, and that there is no more reason for his rejecting a nomination because bad men are going to vote for him than there is for Mr. Hayes declining to run because people like Messrs. Chandler and Cameron are conducting his canvass. Nor is Mr. Adams any more damaged by John Kelly's endorsement than Mr. Hayes is by Ben Butler's. Kelly is much more respectable than Butler, both in public and private life. No one can damage a man of established character by his endorsement any more than by his insults. As unpledged and uncommitted as he is now, Mr. Adams can say as the caliph said when he was reproached for going for a pitcher of water instead of calling his servant: "I arose, and I was Omar; I went, and I was Omar; I came back, and I am Omar still."

Some Republicans of the better sort are deeply grieved by what they consider "the fall" of Mr. Adams. They used to be proud of him, they say; but oh! how changed. What a different Hector he is from the one who came back from England and Geneva! They look at him, and turn away and weep; and look at him again, and again weep. They feel as if they could *not* bear it. It is idle to use cold reason with people who are in great affliction, and with these we accordingly shall not argue. The best thing we can do for them is to try to divert their attention, and we accordingly advise them to turn their eyes away from this sad spectacle. If Adams be lost, he is lost, and there is an end of it. Let them occupy themselves in looking at the Republican party. They will there see a candidate who is pledged to civil-service reform of the most radical kind receiving enthusiastic support from a host of eminent men who think civil-service reform the greatest humbug of the age, and have themselves always delighted in civil-service abuse. In fact, they may be said to be busily engaged in preparing their own funeral pyre, which is a sublime and touching sight. If you look into Plutarch you will find nothing like it in ancient times; and Mr. G. F. Hoar and Mr. Caleb Cushing will tell you that nothing approaching to it occurred in our earlier history. So let us gaze on this and take comfort.

General Butler has, as was expected, and as he had himself arranged, received the Republican nomination in the Seventh Massachusetts District, and at this writing it is doubtful what the better sort of Republicans will do. If the Democrats give them a man they can vote for, they will probably vote for him, and Mr. Tarbox would not be such a man. If not, it is questionable whether

there would be any use in making another nomination. The Republican papers in Massachusetts have at last begun to take the alarm, and are now denouncing Butler in their forcible-feeble way. What is more to the purpose, the *New York Times* has done it most effectively, and, better still, has warned all concerned that this canvass is a reform canvass, and not simply "a bloody-shirt" movement, as so many gentlemen would like to make it, and that persons who are not of a reforming turn will do well not to make themselves too prominent in it. Nothing needs to be said so firmly, and nothing to be said oftener than this; and the *Times*, in saying it, has strengthened the claims on the gratitude of the best portion of the party which it established by its firm and creditable opposition to Mr. Blaine's nomination.

It ought to be borne in mind that Butler's prominence is the natural result of the anti-Southern turn given to the canvass. When the Republican chiefs began preaching a continuance of the civil war, and calling for legislators to "jaw back" in Congress with Ben Hill and his kind, Butler came to the front as naturally as a weed grows on a dunghill. And we must protest against the notion that this anti-Southern spirit has been revived by the conduct of the Democratic House of Representatives. On the contrary, it is the result of a long-planned and artful scheme of some of the Republican politicians. Mr. Blaine set about it in thorough earnest when Congress met—that is, he gave himself up the entire session and from the first week to "drawing" the Southern members of the House, and he was very successful. We have sat in the gallery and watched him doing it, and it was as devilish work as one could wish to see. These Southern members were poor and irritable, and fresh from ruined homes, and unused to controlling their tongues or their temper, and he had no difficulty in engaging them in games of recrimination, in which they were sure to say things which would be likely to "fire the Northern heart." In fact, the process closely resembled that by which the old fire-eaters prepared the South for secession, and that it is now proving fairly successful thus far in its effects on Northern opinion we do not deny. But that it was in the last degree wicked and selfish is also true, and we fervently hope that those Republicans who have faith in the great principles on which not only the Republican party but the Government was first founded, before the military temper was infused into it, and who believe in the sovereign virtue, as political remedies, of kindness, and conciliation, and charity, will see to it that this wretched scheme does not yield *all* the fruits its authors expect from it.

The second New York Democratic Convention has met at Saratoga, and appears to have been a very gloomy body. Mr. Lucius Robinson was nominated by acclamation without any delay, and there was an adjournment without any unnecessary speech-making. John Kelly magnanimously took his name off the list of Presidential electors to make way for that of Mr. Horatio Seymour. Mr. Robinson is a man of excellent character, who was a Republican office-holder during the war, but has since joined the Democrats in disgust. He is said to be a lineal descendant of the Rev. John Robinson, pastor of the Pilgrims at Leyden, which is a much better ancestry for political purposes than Martin Luther. But Mr. Robinson's nomination is not hearty. It is not willingly that the party gives these high places to recent converts, and he has not the slap-on-the-back and punch-in-the-ribs ways which delight "the boys." In fact, there is much depression in the Democratic ranks in this State. Tilden's prestige as a manager has been seriously damaged by the fiasco at Saratoga, and then the non-appearance of his income-tax explanation is disheartening, and the nomination of a "daily-bath man" and an old Republican in Massachusetts is, after all, a

thing to be made the best of, not rejoiced over. The only recent bad sign in the Republican canvass is the increasing prominence assumed by Mr. Blaine, which, the managers may rely on it, will not go down with the loose vote, in spite of the Maine election. The news about the condition of the Germans in Ohio is not good, and it had better be looked to. They are a suspicious race of politicians, and, from what we hear, Mr. Schurz is unable to hold them, even with his admissions about the Administration; so that they had better not be pressed too hard with unsavory morsels. They know nothing about the American fidelity to "great leaders."

Mr. Tilden's explanation about his income-tax has not yet appeared, though there are still rumors that it is in preparation, that when it appears it will be very pathetic, and will show enormous losses in helping his unsuccessful brothers. Unless it shows a partnership with his brothers, it will be no legal answer to the charge of perjury; but if it shows actual loss to the required amount, it will be to some a moral answer to the charge of "withholding money from the Government in the hour of its peril." His canvass is apparently going on with the usual elaboration. He has a large room, or two rooms, at Albany, filled with able and ready writers, either addressing letters to local "workers" or preparing articles for the press, though we fancy the letters are more effective than the articles. The *Terre Haute* "fraud" is now seldom spoken of by his enemies, their eyes having apparently been opened to its defects as a charge. We, however, occasionally receive judgments from gentlemen in different parts of the country who have "held court" on it, finding it fully proved, and ordering the old rascal to make restitution to his victims. We file these judgments as they are received; however, there ought in all these cases to be a stay of execution for sixty days, or until the United States Court hears the evidence. *Harper's Weekly* has made the matter a little more mysterious by pushing on with its illustration about the executors and heirs-at-law. It first compared Tilden to an executor who had, after paying the legacies, pocketed the residuum, and was being sued by the "heir-at-law" (next of kin); but, as we pointed out, the "heir-at-law" is in this case the testator, so that the testator is suing his own executor as next of kin for the remainder of his own estate. The *Weekly* now says that Tilden's answer is "virtually that as administrator he could only recognize the dead, and not the heirs-at-law," which carries the whole business beyond our ken, and suggests the propriety of putting it into the hands of a good "medium."

Professor W. G. Sumner has published a letter, giving his reasons for voting for Tilden, which contains, in the main, as sound a body of political doctrine as we have lately seen. He objects to the mode of selecting Mr. Hayes as somewhat farcical—an accident arising out of the dissatisfaction of Simon Cameron with the failure of the Pennsylvania delegation to vote as a unit. He objects to Mr. Hayes himself as a man who is, for the purposes of such an election, obscure—i.e., has not worked his way to it through a conspicuous career, which would enable people to judge of his fitness without the aid of private testimonials; and he treats with well-merited scorn the current rant of many of the Republican papers about the badness of Democrats as such. But he overlooks the great peculiarity of the situation, which is that a strange combination of circumstances has left the country for several years without a respectable Opposition. In other words, the defection of the South, and the withdrawal of its ablest men during the war, have left the Democratic party in the condition of a Rump and given it the characteristics of a Rump. It is not possible under these circumstances to follow the old and sound political rule, which makes expulsion from office of the party in power the proper remedy for bad administration. This rule is based on the hypothesis that there is a respectable Opposition ready to take its place. He overlooks one other thing, that there is in every party a strong and constant tendency towards the standards and ideals of the bulk of its members, and this fact of itself makes dangerous a party which

has, no matter through what causes, included in its ranks the great body of the ignorant population of the country. This may be said of the Republican party in view of its late negro additions; but the negroes are not yet a political force. They have no traditions and vote in leading-strings.

There has been some talk during the week of a disagreement between Mr. Schurz and the Republican National Committee, arising out of some fierce denunciations of him which have appeared in the *Washington Republican* for his freedom in talking of the shortcomings of the present Administration, and for his alleged utterance of unfavorable predictions regarding the result of the election in Ohio. He has, however, denied positively that any such differences have arisen, and that he ever uttered any such predictions, and Mr. Chandler confirms the denial. There is, nevertheless, a strong suspicion afloat that some unpleasantness has arisen, or the *Washington* organ would never have spoken out in this violent way, and the probabilities are that in inner "Administration circles" there is dissatisfaction with Mr. Schurz's habit of putting criticism into his speeches, but that the Committee does not feel that it would be wise to take up the court quarrel. As to the criticism, we do not see how Mr. Schurz is to avoid it if he is to preserve his self-respect and his influence. It will not do for him, or for any of the Liberal Republicans, to pretend now that the Republican party has been, during the last five years, a blameless and wise body, and that the present opposition to it is conceived in iniquity. This sort of gymnastics may be pardoned in people like Banks; but men who look forward to a political future must take care of their reputation for honesty. Banks is greatly troubled by the condition of the South, and feels the absolute necessity of a stern policy towards that misguided region; he is surprised, too, at the wickedness of the Democrats, and is waiting for a Republican nomination.

Governor Chamberlain has been renominated in South Carolina, and the Democrats, who exhibited a considerable amount of discord before their own convention, are united in opposition to him. The *Charleston News and Courier*, which had been up to that time a warm supporter of Chamberlain, has abandoned him and wheeled into line, and appears to think there is some chance of the State going Democratic on two campaign issues—"the proved inability of the Republican administration to preserve the peace and enforce the laws in South Carolina, and the inability of the Republican party, because of the character of its leaders and members, to give the people a government under which the rights of all classes shall have equal protection, a government founded on intelligence and virtue, which will secure to the State, in every form, reform, retrenchment, and relief." The *News and Courier* says that the rest of the State ticket is as bad as can be, the candidate for Secretary of State being "denounced as a corruptionist," and the candidate for the Attorney-Generalship, R. B. Elliott, being "open to every objection that lay against Whipper as a judge." The Convention is described as the "worst gathering of knaves and ignoramuses that Columbia has seen," which shows that it must have been pretty bad, and the newspapers do not even pretend to discuss the platform adopted. The present attitude of the parties in South Carolina is much to be regretted, for the crisis is very near at hand in which it must be decided whether the whites are finally to govern it or the blacks, and it would have been better if the inevitable end could have been reached under a moderate man like Chamberlain; but this desirable termination of the South Carolina imbroglio has been frustrated partly by the scandalous corruption of the dominant party and partly by the spirit of revenge which this has bred in the other.

The Republicans of the Fourth Congressional District in Illinois have set a very good example in their mode of nominating Mr. Wm. Lathrop for Congress. Mr. Lathrop is, we believe, an excellent candidate, which is so far good, but, better still, he has been nomi-



nated on resolutions, which we believe he himself drafted, that specifically pledge him to "a faithful observance of the fifth resolution of the national platform and the doctrine of Mr. Hayes's letter of acceptance," and "to the use of all the power and influence he may possess as a representative" to the carrying out of this doctrine. The resolutions, moreover, denounce the bestowal and promise of offices for party services as "only second to the crime of selling offices for a stipulated price." To make assurance doubly sure, the above-named plank of the national platform and the passage of Mr. Hayes's letter of acceptance relating to civil-service reform are appended in full. This is the way to go to work. To enable the President to reform the civil service, representatives and senators must be pledged to help him or let him alone.

The past summer has been a very fortunate one for American sports on sea and land. The failure of the *Countess of Dufferin* in her attempt to get back the honors won years ago by the *America*, the unexpected success of the American crews in competing with the English on the Schuylkill, and the victory in rifle-shooting at Creedmoor were more than could have been expected, and taken together seem to show that the athletic and sporting *furor* of the last twenty years has really had already a sufficiently pronounced effect upon the much-abused American constitution to make Mr. Huxley's late declaration that there was no material difference between trans- and cis-Atlantic "types" seem reasonable. The race between the *Countess of Dufferin* and the *Madelaine* can hardly be said to have proved anything with regard to the superiority of American to foreign yachting. This, we take it, is caused in a measure by the superiority of our waters, the half landlocked character of our coast making the sea exceptionally smooth, and therefore enabling builders to devote themselves entirely to speed, without much regard to safety. On the other hand, the Canadian vessel this year had the advantage of being built for American waters, just as the *America* twenty years ago had the disadvantage of being sailed in foreign waters. The rowing at Philadelphia was a much better proof of the progress of sports in this country, and the extraordinary success of Yale in rowing almost evenly with the London Rowing Club—the best in the world—is not to be explained on any other theory than that, with equal training, we have as good material as the English. It seems to be another proof, also, of the wisdom of Yale in going to England for this training, which could have been got nowhere else. The race in which the Beaverwycks beat the London Club, and in which the latter made a claim of foul, was really not nearly such a good test as the other. There does not seem to have been any ground for the allowance of a foul; but the time of the race was not remarkable, and has been beaten over and over again. The system of rowing in "heats," which seems at first sight a good substitute for the plan which has broken down at Saratoga, does not appear to have worked well. Crews are matched against each other unexpectedly, and there is not the feeling at the end of the races that the best crew has won. We understand that there was a suspicion among the American crews that in the "drawings," far from there being any national sharp-practice, all the doubts were decided in favor of the foreign crews, though we do not know of any evidence to support the charge. But these races, and the fate of the Saratoga rowing association, show that rowing regattas on a gigantic scale, though well enough to attract a crowd, are fundamental mistakes from the rowing-man's point of view. The shooting at Creedmoor seems, as usual, to have been well managed, and no fault has been found with anybody concerned. Newspapers which opposed the election of Judge Gildersleeve a year or so ago, on the ground that his skill in rifle-shooting was not, as maintained by his friends, a proper qualification for high judicial office, are now compelled to admit that he is a credit to the bench.

General trade this autumn fully equals expectations, and there is a growing belief that at last a permanent recovery from the depres-

sion of the past three years has begun. During the week the volume of business has been larger than for years, and, what is most important, business is done at a profit. In Wall Street little heed is apparently given to the favorable change in the mercantile situation, and speculators who have been enriched by the large decline in coal stocks are still seeking to win by a decline in all corporate securities. Without doubt the developments in some of the coal companies are such as to impair confidence in corporate management, and to this extent there is reason why all securities should suffer. The New Jersey Central Railroad has issued a statement showing the necessity it is under of raising money to meet current obligations. This it proposed to do by the sale of \$5,000,000 bonds; as we write, it is not known that the bonds have been taken. The Delaware and Hudson Canal Company has issued a circular to its stockholders in which it declares its ability to meet all obligations on its bonds, and that its condition is sound. The latest figures given in support of this are of date December 31, 1875. The Pennsylvania Coal Company, which has the largest surplus of any of the coal companies, has sold 100,000 tons of its product at auction, an exceptional course for it to take; the Delaware, Lackawanna, and Western Railroad has advertised another sale of 100,000 tons. Coal securities declined during the week, while other railroad securities, notwithstanding the tendency of speculation to lower prices, have advanced. The gold market has been dull, and the United States legal-tender note for one dollar has had a gold value varying from \$0.9080 to \$0.9111. Silver has been very steady in London.

Mr. Baring, the English Secretary of Legation at Constantinople, has made his report on the Turkish atrocities in Bulgaria, and it fully confirms Mr. Schuyler's. He puts down the number of persons massacred at 12,000, and the number of villages burnt at 52, while he does not believe more than 200 Mussulmans in all were killed. The most fearful part of the tragedy occurred at Batak, which Mr. Schuyler had already described. There the people of the village surrendered their arms under a solemn promise of safety from Achmet Aga, the Turkish commander, and were butchered like sheep, young and old, male and female, to the number of 5,000, and their bodies left unburied. Achmet Aga and several other leaders of the same stamp have been decorated by the Government. An insurrection in aid of the Servians appears undoubtedly to have been planned by the Bulgarians, and the programme of the leaders which has been found provided for the destruction of railroads, the seizure of Government stores, and the burning of certain villages, the drafting of all Bulgarians, and the killing of resisting Mussulmans. It was, in short, one of the ordinary revolutionary plans; meeting it with wholesale massacre was, as Mr. Baring says, "the most heinous crime that has stained the history of the present century." The excitement in England still continues, and has been aggravated by the appearance of a characteristic pamphlet from Mr. Gladstone, denouncing both the Ministry and the Turks in the most unmeasured terms.

At the seat of war the situation, if possible, grows more serious. The demands with which Turkey accompanies the offer of a month's armistice are, to three of the Powers, simply exorbitant, but to the Russians they are exasperating, and help to feed the flame of popular excitement which is threatening to sweep the Government into war. Already the Russian volunteers have crowded into Serbia in such numbers that they appear to have got the control of the army, and Tcherniaieff has actually taken on himself the responsibility of proclaiming Prince Milan King of Serbia, apparently a sort of defiant reply to the Turkish demand that he should make a fresh acknowledgment of his vassalage by accepting reinvestiture at the hands of the Sultan. The weather, too, has turned against the invaders by flooding the valleys and breaking up the roads, and quick decision of some kind seems absolutely necessary for the Turks. But the probabilities are that they have virtually lost Bosnia, Herzegovina, and Bulgaria.

## THE PART OF RELIGION IN THE TURKISH PROBLEM.

THE military energy displayed by the Turks in the contest with Serbia has not unnaturally astonished those who had seen the insurrection in Herzegovina carried on by small, irregular bands for over a year, and is undoubtedly about to have a very important influence on the political situation in the negotiations now pending. Serbia would hardly have been urged on as much as she was by Russia if it had been supposed she would receive a thrashing. The feebleness of the operations in Herzegovina made it look as if the Sultan's time had come, and as if a little weight added to the insurrection would finish the European Empire. It was unquestionably in this belief that the Servians took the field, and that the Powers looked on so complacently. Not, probably, that they would permit a break-up of the Empire; but they expected enough Christian success to furnish a solid basis of fact for the Andrassy and the Berlin notes, and take away from them the reproach of being the result of foreign pressure. As matters have gone, they would have been rather awkwardly situated if the Turks had carried on the war in a civilized way, for the Porte would have furnished, by its success, an argument which the great military Powers would find it hard to resist, for being allowed to conduct its internal affairs in its own way. But the atrocities in Bulgaria supply a reason for interference such as no victories of the Servians could ever have supplied, for they have destroyed in England the jealousy of Russia which has been now for fifty years the great obstacle to any settlement of the Eastern problem. There has, perhaps, been nothing stranger of late in European politics than Sir Stafford Northcote, the Chancellor of the Exchequer, defending the Ministry before a large audience against the charge of being influenced by this jealousy. It indicated a revolution in popular sentiment which may be the beginning of very important and far-reaching changes in Continental politics. People in England are now beginning to ask themselves in a startled way how they ever came to respect the Turks, or have any sympathy with them, or bolster them up, and why, too, the Turks were not found out sooner; and a strong feeling of shame is running through the nation at the reflection that possibly the recent ordering up of the fleet to Besika Bay by Mr. Disraeli may have helped to prolong or aggravate the atrocities practised in Bulgaria.

The answer to the question why the Turks needed to massacre 12,000 persons, including women and children, and burn sixty villages, in order to give Europe an insight into their real character, cannot be given in a few words, and there is hardly a more curious question in modern history. They massacred in the Greek insurrection, just as they have done now, on a great scale. They put over 25,000 persons to the sword in Scio in 1822, and they must have killed fully as many in cold blood in the Morea. They have also indulged in slight massacres since then, in the midst of peace, in various parts of the Asiatic Empire. All over the Empire massacre is well recognized by both Turks and Christians as the great Turkish remedy for political troubles. There is, probably, no political or social doctrine more firmly held by the bulk of the Mussulman population than that Christians hold their lives and property on sufferance, and on condition of quiet and submission. It has run through the jurisprudence of the Empire from the earliest days of Turkish dominion, and enters into the political and social training of all good Mussulmans. The Christian's existence, his property, all he has and all he is, are evidences of the clemency, not of the justice, of the true believers. When Christians revolt, or threaten to revolt, wholesale slaughter seems a natural remedy. The killing of Christians is to them not murder, and robbing them is not robbery, if the condition of submissiveness has been or seems likely to be violated.

There is nothing singular, of course, in the fact that the Turks held this theory when they entered Europe. It was a not unnatural theory for a conquering Asiatic horde to hold. What is marvellous about it is that, after dwelling for four centuries as a minority in the midst of a Christian population, often in the same villages, always

in the same towns, and engaged in dealings of all sorts with them, the Turkish heart should have not become softened, or the Turk's sense of human equality and of neighborly dependence quickened. Moreover, he has during the last two centuries witnessed the decline of his own state in political power and importance through the advance of the Christian states in civilization, and during the last fifty years has observed great progress on the part of the Christian population in wealth and industry and enterprise, and yet, outside the official class at Constantinople, which constantly feels the pricking of foreign bayonets, he shows no sign of emulation or any desire to imitate. In fact, according to the best evidence, the wondrous spectacle of Western progress, in so far as the Turk sees it, excites no feeling in his breast but one of dull hatred and repulsion. Nor is this the result of race. The Magyars are precisely the same breed of men as the Ottomans, and they have become by long residence in Europe so thoroughly Europeanized that, though one of the purest races in the world, their features have lost the Tartar cast, and they have become some of the best politicians in the West. The Bosnian Mussulmans, who are all of Slavonic origin, turn away from the civilization of Christendom with just as much contempt as their Oriental brethren in Anatolia. The same phenomenon shows itself among the Mussulmans in British India. While the Hindoos are flinging themselves pretty freely into the stream of progress prepared for the natives by the British Government, in the shape of offices and education, the Mussulmans still hold proudly aloof, sullen, suspicious, and restless, with a pride and a faith which are alike unconquerable. In short, it is the religion which has worked the mischief and which has created what seems to be an almost impassable moral, social, and intellectual barrier between the Mussulman world, containing a population of 160,000,000, and all the active, moving portion of the race. Everywhere, except in Africa, where it seems to be making great progress among the negroes, and to lift them very distinctly one step upwards, it acts as a sort of paralysis, deadening the faculties, and producing in curious combination an ascetic impression of the uselessness and futility of this life with a keen susceptibility to sensual enjoyment. That is to say, a good Mussulman believes as profoundly in the evanescence of earthly things as a Christian monk, but feels no necessity of preparing for any other state; so that no pleasure comes amiss to him, and unnecessary self-denial is to him a hardly comprehensible virtue.

When we read in our day of the Turk's doings in Greece and Bulgaria, great as our horror may be, it gives us little idea of the tremor which went through Europe in the fifteenth and sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, when the news came that he was on his way to Vienna, or was harrying the coasts of the Mediterranean, and when there was no certainty whatever that the best fleet or army the Christian world could raise could withstand him. But the men of that day on their side could never have anticipated the difficulty in which the Christian Powers now find themselves. It is as easy for the Christian states to break up the Turkish Empire in Europe as to quell a riot, and yet everybody feels that they would then be face to face with a far greater problem than the military problem—the difficulty of disposing of the Mussulman population, of finding some way in which they can live in a civilized state on terms of equality before the law, and in the practice of the peaceful arts. And yet they are not a degraded, or inferior, or stupid race. Indeed, the Turks in Europe are not a distinct race at all. They are, for the most part, sober, robust, temperate men, of fine physique, with many points of political and moral superiority to their Christian neighbors, able and brave in war, capable of great lines of policy and of considerable achievements in the arts, and with no proved or necessary unfitness for the best modern culture. The spell that lies on them, and makes them the puzzle of modern statesmen and the loathing of modern philanthropists; which makes them, in the eyes of millions, beasts, whom it is holy and joyous to slay, as one slays the tiger or the wolf, is simply their religious faith, and no amount of historical research



could give us half so clear an impression of the mental condition of a considerable portion of Christendom in the sixteenth century as he now gives us by the ferocious intensity of his belief. When he is reduced to a condition of impotent peaceableness and toleration, we shall have lost the last modern reminder of the state of feeling in which England burnt heretics, and Frenchmen and Germans cut each other's throats.

#### THE WORK STILL BEFORE REFORMERS.

NOTHING is more noticeable in the conduct of the political campaign than the almost exclusive attention bestowed by Republican orators upon the Southern question. The party managers have chosen this as the issue on which to fight their battle. They have done this not only in Western States like Indiana, where the currency question might be considered dangerous ground, but in Vermont and Maine, where the strong hard-money sentiment, together with the repeal of the resumption clause by a Democratic House, seemed to offer a tempting opportunity for a new line of attack. But in these States, and throughout the country generally, the Republican spokesmen for the most part have touched very lightly on the currency, have given a barely civil recognition to Administrative reform, and have thrown their main force on the condition and necessities of the South. Their treatment of the subject is extremely simple. It is in reality one of the most complicated and perplexing questions with which American statesmanship has ever been summoned to deal. But the Republican campaign orators recognize but a single fact, real or assumed—the hostility among the Southern whites toward the freedmen in their political capacity; they propose but a single remedy—the election of a Republican President and Congress to serve as guardians of the freedmen's rights. When we remember how the inherent difficulties of the Southern situation have been aggravated by rascally officials under the form of a Republican administration at Washington; when we remember the Freedmen's Savings-Bank and its Republican trustees; when we look at Casey, Packard, Spencer, and their compeers; when, in a word, it is considered that the Republicans have controlled the general Government since the close of the war, and that it is under their own administration that the South has come to its present condition, the effrontery with which the party leaders, confessing no errors and offering no new ideas, demand a new lease of power simply on the ground that they alone are fit to take care of the South, is simply amazing. This is exactly what they are doing; and so thoroughly have they stamped this character on the canvass that Mr. Wheeler, whose especial recommendation to thoughtful men was his sensible and moderate tone toward the South, has been driven into line, and in Vermont raised the cry of danger from the ex-Confederates as lustily as anybody. Mr. Boutwell in Massachusetts, and Mr. Blaine in his own State, make this the burden of their song; General Butler is urged for re-election to Congress on the ground that he can bother the rebels; it is the same story everywhere.

If any one thinks that in taking this course the Republican managers are making a blunder, even as politicians, and mistaking the temper of the voters whose support they seek, the election returns from Vermont and Maine should undeceive him. Messrs. Blaine, Morton, Boutwell, and company are wise in their generation. They are appealing adroitly, and we judge successfully, to a sentiment whose prodigious strength in the mass of the Northern people has been underrated by the advocates of political reform. It is the characteristic mistake of reformers to forget how very slowly a new idea penetrates the community at large. Of the voting population of the North, an immense proportion are still dominated by the sentiments that the civil war engendered. That four-years' struggle, reaching every household in the land, coming close home to the dearest interests and the deepest feelings of the entire population, gave an impress to the popular habit of thought and action which a decade has by no means effaced. Men who live by ideas, and constantly readjust their minds by the perception of

new facts, are apt to forget how few, how simple, and how deeply-rooted are the sentiments that govern the mass of mankind. Such a sentiment, in the political communities of the Northern States—and especially in the rural communities, which hold the preponderance of power—is the feeling generated by the War of the Rebellion; a feeling which includes distrust of the Southern whites and their Northern allies, and jealous sensitiveness in behalf of the negroes. So general and profound is this sentiment that by appealing to it the Republican managers can even yet divert attention from all their past sins and from the palpable barrenness of their programme for the future. They were driven to make some concessions to the reformers in their platform and candidates, but in conducting the campaign their principal tribute to reform consists in reckless denunciations of Mr. Tilden; and they fight their main battle on the old issue of North against South.

We by no means forget that the South on its part is also to some extent acting on ideas inherited from the past. But their past does not alarm us so much as it does some of our friends, because, first, the two vicious principles of secession and slavery—*fons et origo malorum*—have been killed past resurrection by the logic of facts; and, further, the heavy hand of the Federal Government, which alone could put down the Rebellion and slavery, serves now mainly to aggravate the slowly-healing wounds. It is one thing to amputate a diseased leg, and another to go on indefinitely whittling at the stump.

But our immediate purpose in this article is to point out the general fact, illustrated by the successful appeal of the party orators to the old war spirit, that in a democracy like ours new ideas are slow of establishment, and old ideas once firmly rooted are extremely tenacious. The old commonplace about the levity and fickleness of republics was the very reverse of truth. Our national history is full of examples to the contrary. The slavery question, though involving on both sides the most inflammable elements of feeling, and though stimulated by a series of exciting incidents—Nullification, riots, Texas annexation and the Mexican war, the Fugitive Slave Law, border warfare—was yet forty years in fairly arraying the nation into two hostile parties. But when once engaged in civil war, only the complete exhaustion of one party or the other could end the struggle. It is needless to multiply instances.

Those who believe with us that the radical reform of our civil-service system is the most pressing necessity of the nation, ought to face these facts and to prepare themselves for a long campaign. It is altogether hopeless to look to any national convention or Presidential election for an immediate settlement of the question. We must patiently educate the mass of the people to the point of demanding and enforcing the reform. It must be observed, too, that this civil-service question especially requires a full education of the people, because the reform can only be secured by direct popular pressure. A President cannot, and Congress will not abolish the spoils system except as the people absolutely insist on it. This is the one matter in which Congressmen, as a body, have a personal interest wholly apart from and opposed to the public interest. On any other question—the currency, for example—the average Congressman has no other personal interest than to adapt himself to the strongest current of opinion in the people or the party. But it is by his control over the Federal offices in his district that he expects to get and keep his own seat in Congress. To propose that Congressmen shall have no control over these offices is by no means, as Governor Hayes in his letter of acceptance seems to consider it, to offer them a favor that they will eagerly welcome; it is to propose a "self-denying ordinance," which they will receive about as most of us would receive an invitation to sell all that we have and give to the poor. To elect a President bent on civil-service reform is no light matter in itself, but it is a trifle compared to the election of a Congress which will let him take the first step towards radical reform. And in the contest that must at once arise between a reforming President and an ordinary Congress, the latter has immensely the advantage of position.

The Senate can block the game instantly, and in a strictly constitutional way, by simply refusing to confirm any appointees made in disregard of Congressmen's claims. Let it be remembered that each Senator has, on the average, three years of service before him, and that even at the end of that time he will not have to face a popular constituency; that the secrecy of executive sessions makes it difficult to fix responsibility on individual senators; that it will generally be easy to raise a cloud of dust over the merits of any particular appointment, and that the dominant party in the House can for its part embarrass almost hopelessly a President who offends it. We see but one thing that could give the victory to a reforming President in such a struggle, and that is a demonstration of public sentiment so unanimous, so active, and so determined that even the Senate would be overborne by its moral weight. We are bound to say that as yet we see no signs that any such popular uprising would respond to the act of the President who should set himself in earnest to reform the civil service.

It is clear, we think, that men who desire reform have only begun their duty when they have supported the Presidential candidate whom they judge fittest to undertake it. There presses upon them the immediate farther duty of securing the nomination of trustworthy men for Congress, or, at the least, of effectively rebuking such shamelessly unfit nominations as that which the "regular Republican" Convention of the Seventh District in Massachusetts has made. But, over and above all that relates to the impending election, there must be a patient, persistent education of the entire people in the fundamental principles of genuine reform.

#### THE TEACHING OF PHILOSOPHY IN OUR COLLEGES.

WE print in another column an interesting letter on this subject from a correspondent, with whom, it is needless to say, we fully agree. The evil he deplures has been, and still is, a real one. The philosophical teaching, as a rule, in our higher seminaries is in the hands of the president, who is usually a minister of the Gospel, and, as he more often owes his position to general excellence of character and administrative faculty than to any speculative gifts or propensities, it usually follows that "safeness" becomes the main characteristic of his tuition; that his classes are edified rather than awakened, and leave college with the generous youthful impulse, to reflect on the world and our position in it, rather dampened and discouraged than stimulated by the lifeless discussions and flabby formulas they have had to commit to memory. In Germany, as if by a sort of compensation for the long political enslavement of the country, philosophic speculation has gone on as a rule without any reference to its ecclesiastical consequences. In England and this country, on the contrary, whilst speculation on political and practical matters has been free as air, metaphysical thought has always been haunted by the consciousness of the religious orthodoxy of the country, and either assiduously sought to harmonize itself therewith, or, if sceptical in character, it has been trammelled and paralyzed and made petty by the invidious presence of this polemic bias. The form of philosophic problems and discussions, in short, is too apt to be set for us by the existence of the Church. England is just beginning to emerge from this condition; but until we are fully emancipated from the traditional college régime, no really able movement of philosophic thought can be hoped for among us.

Let it not be supposed that we are prejudging the question whether the final results of speculation will be friendly or hostile to the formulas of Christian thought. All we contend for is that we, like the Greeks and the Germans, should now attack things as if there were no official answer pre-occupying the field. At present we are bribed beforehand by our reverence or dislike for the official answer; and the free-thinking tendency which the *Popular Science Monthly*, for example, represents, is condemned to an even more dismal shallowness than the spiritualistic systems of our textbooks of "Mental Science." We work with one eye on our problem, and with the other on the consequences to our enemy or to our lawgiver, as our case may be; the result in both cases alike is mediocrity.

If the best use of our colleges is to give young men a wider openness of mind and a more flexible way of thinking than special technical training can generate, then we hold that philosophy (taken in the broad sense in which our correspondent uses the word) is the most important of all college studies. However sceptical one may be of the attainment of universal truths (and, to make our position more emphatic, we are willing here to concede the extreme Positivist position), one can never deny that philo-

sophic study means the habit of always seeing an alternative, of not taking the usual for granted, of making conventionalities fluid again, of imagining foreign states of mind. In a word, it means the possession of mental perspective. Touchstone's question, "Hast any philosophy in thee, shepherd?" will never cease to be one of the tests of a well-born nature. It says, Is there space and air in your mind, or must your companions gasp for breath whenever they talk with you? And if our colleges are to make men, and not machines, they should look, above all things, to this aspect of their influence. Here indeed lies the real interest of the question which is sure sooner or later to convulse the universities—the question whether Greek shall remain obligatory or not. As philologic training, Greek is but a language among others. Its value to the universal college student literally consists in its being a "humanity"—in its bringing him into contact with a different human life from that which he sees, but one whose eminent worth he must nevertheless acutely feel. Its function is what we have called philosophical as distinguished from technical. Teach all sciences in a liberal and philosophic manner, and Greek ceases to be indispensable. Teach Greek in a dry, grammatic fashion, and it becomes no better than Gothic. So that the decision of the Greek question depends on the decision of the philosophic question. "G. S. II." speaks of the "application of philosophic systems to history, politics, and law." We hope he does not mean that these should be taught separately from the ordinary historical, political, and legal courses. That would be building a house and getting a man from the city to come down and put on the "architecture" afterwards. All branches must be taught from the first in a philosophic manner, must be saturated with the liberal spirit, for any good to be effected.

As for philosophy, technically so called, or the reflection of man on his relations with the universe, its educational essence lies in the quickening of the spirit to its problems. What doctrines students take from their teachers are of little consequence provided they catch from them the living, philosophic attitude of mind, the independent, personal look at all the data of life, and the eagerness to harmonize them. Youth is certainly the time when the impulse to metaphysical reflection is in its flower—certain authors say it disappears after thirty. The "supposed unpopularity" of these studies alluded to by our correspondent is, we are convinced, a mistake, in spite of the dead teaching. We have been assured by the librarian of one of the largest of our college libraries that the metaphysical alcove there is twice as much visited as any other, and we are quite sure that this is the result of a perfectly normal law.

It is probable that the unfortunate condition of things which "G. S. II." and we alike regret is already on the eve of changing. Physical science is becoming so speculative and audacious in its constructions, and at the same time so authoritative, that all doctrines find themselves, willy-nilly, compelled to settle their accounts and make new treaties with it. Every newspaper and magazine overflows with symptoms of the new fermentation. What, then, is man? is once more a keen and urgent problem; the very atmosphere is pregnant with new-formed essays at its solution. The sleepiest doctor-of-divinity-like repose must soon be awakened at its teaching-desk, and, getting disquieted at the novel agitation around its throne, end by abdicating in favor of teachers of more alert temperament. "The marvelous new developments in England and Germany," whatever their intrinsic worth may be, have at least enough momentum of prestige in the popular eye to effect this. It is more than doubtful whether Fechner's "psychophysical law" (that sensation is proportional to the logarithm of its stimulus) is of any great *psychological* importance, and we strongly suspect that Helmholtz's "unconscious inferences" are not the last word of wisdom in the study of perception; but because these things are very difficult and very "scientific," people who do not understand them will remain persuaded that they are of portentous moment, and will mistrust all teachers who have not swallowed and assimilated them. There is indeed something touching in the helpless way in which Fechner's law is beginning to be hawked about, as it were, in popular philosophic literature, by writers who do not know in the least what to do with it, but who evidently feel persuaded that somehow or other it must be of tremendous import. But be these discoveries important or not important, the fact that they involve a change in the method and personnel of philosophic study is unshaken. To criticise these "new developments" at all, one must have gone through a thorough physiological training. And accordingly, we find Leipzig, now the foremost university in Germany, calling the eminent physiologist Wundt to fill its principal philosophic chair; and a metaphysician like Dr. McCosh writing, in a chapter on the future of his favorite study: "The metaphysician must enter the physiological field. He must, if he can, conduct researches; he must at least master the ascertained facts.



He must not give up the study of the nervous system and brain to those who cannot comprehend anything beyond . . . their senses."

In short, philosophy, like Molière, claims her own where she finds it. She finds much of it to-day in physics and natural history, and must and will educate herself accordingly. Young men who aspire to professorships and who will bear this in mind will, we are sure, before many years find a number of vacant places calling for their peculiar capacity. Meanwhile, when we find announced that the students in Harvard College next year may study any or all of the following works under the guidance of different professors—Locke's 'Essay,' Kant's 'Kritik,' Schopenhauer and Hartmann, Hodgson's 'Theory of Practice,' and Spencer's 'Psychology'—we need not complain of *universal* academic stagnation, even to-day.

#### THE FUTURE OF THE TORY ADMINISTRATION.

TROUVILLE, September 1, 1876.

I LEFT London on the night on which Mr. Disraeli was proclaimed an earl. It is almost an old story now, but people are still enquiring as to his reasons for retiring from the House of Commons at this particular time, and speculating on the effects of it, and students of his novels are busying themselves in ferreting out passages which tend to throw light upon the proceeding. And yet there ought to have been nothing unexpected about it. Since the early days when 'The Young Duke' was in preparation Mr. Disraeli had it in his mind to push his way upwards, if he possibly could, to the highest post in the British Empire, and, having done so, to wrap himself in the solemn dignity of a peerage. It was the coping-stone placed on an eventful life before the final exodus to Westminster Abbey. "One thing is clear," he says in 'The Young Duke'—"one thing is clear: that a man may speak well in the House of Commons, and fail very completely in the House of Lords. There are two distinct styles requisite. I intend in the course of my career, if I have time, to give a specimen of both. In the Lower House 'Don Juan' may, perhaps, be our model; in the Upper House 'Paradise Lost.'" Given the requisite time and the resolution, the moment for carrying it out was a mere matter of choice. The party to which Mr. Disraeli has attached himself since he threw aside the radical rôle of his early youth, is at the present moment at the very summit of prosperity. In the House of Commons its strength and discipline are but slightly if at all impaired. It can do whatever its leaders wish. The opposite party is numerically no stronger than it was three sessions ago, notwithstanding that near a hundred changes have taken place in the constitution of the House of Commons, while in point of discipline and coherence it has gone from bad to worse. It is powerless to present an effectual opposition to any movement of the Government. It can carry on a guerilla warfare under several independent chiefs, who profess a wavering allegiance to the nominal leader of the party. But a strong Government, with a solid voting power behind it, is impervious to such attacks. Individual members of the Administration may be made to wince from time to time, but the united body is not affected. In the House of Lords the Tory party now, as it always has been, is omnipotent. In the country there is no manifestation of any real dissatisfaction with the Ministry and its policy. Efforts have been made by Liberal press-men and Radical agitators to turn the tide of public opinion upon several occasions during the past twelve months, and to bring the whole force of its current into new channels directed against the policy or the action of the Ministry, and now and again these efforts have had a fair show of success. But something new has always turned up to stem the waters of dissatisfaction as they appeared to be gathering strength, and to dissipate them here and there over the face of the land, or even to turn them against the engineers who were directing them. The noise and bustle over the Slave circulars came to naught despite the energetic efforts made at the commencement of the session by all the regular agitators and platform-men throughout the country. The turmoil over the Royal-Titles Act was more threatening, owing to the folly of the Prime Minister, but the genuinely strong feeling which was aroused by that measure and the Prime Minister's conduct of it was mainly confined to London, and not to the whole of London, but chiefly to the Club-men, the Press-men, and 'Society.' The feeling in these circles was intense, and it was fast gaining force when Mr. Lowe made his unfortunate speech at Ratford, in which he asserted that the Queen had on two occasions previously attempted to persuade her Prime Ministers to make her an Empress. This speech and the public apology which Mr. Lowe felt himself compelled to make dispersed in one moment the cloud of mist which was fast enveloping Mr. Disraeli and his ministry. The purchase of the Suez Canal shares, and all the transactions therewith connected, formed a good ground of indictment against the Administration. But the

indictment was badly drawn and preferred, and it was cast by the House of Commons almost without a hearing. Mr. Gladstone and Mr. Lowe went off into captious criticisms upon the details of the machinery by which the transaction was conducted, instead of making an onslaught upon the transaction itself, and they failed to secure an audience.

And now we are in the midst of a new agitation. The Government is arraigned at the bar of public opinion because the Turkish soldiery and irregulars have carried on a brutal war with circumstances of mediæval atrocity. I do not know whether this new stalking-horse will prove to have more vitality in him than his predecessors. I cannot think he will. No one can feel greater abhorrence of the cruelties which are being perpetrated in Bulgaria than I do, but I fail to appreciate the logic which throws the responsibility of Turkish cruelties upon the British Government. The Turkish mode of carrying on war proves that Mr. Freeman does not exaggerate when he says that five hundred years' existence as a conquering tribe on the skirts of civilized Europe does not eradicate the savage element out of the Turkish hosts, and the exposure of their mode of warfare will probably do more to hasten the solution of the Eastern question than generations of diplomacy. But the solution of the Eastern question is one thing, and the discredit of the British Government from a party point of view is another thing; and while the first may be brought about by harrowing sketches of the Bulgarian atrocities, it does not seem to me to come within the sphere of fair party warfare to employ the same agency for the other, and I cannot think that such a policy will succeed. Abroad the position of England is stronger than it was during the five years of Mr. Gladstone's administration. The pacific policy which he supported, though probably a good policy in itself, did not succeed abroad. England undoubtedly declined in Continental estimation. It may be that the ground on which foreign governments and peoples have raised their opinion of England's strength, and willingness, if need be, to employ her strength, may not be so substantial as they seem. But the change in estimation, whether it be groundless or substantial, is due to the action of the present Ministry and to the fact that the Tory party is in power. We may awaken one day to find that we were better as we were, but for the moment the credit, such as it is, of raising England in the estimation of foreign nations counts to the gain of the Tories. In the House of Commons, therefore, in the House of Lords, at home and abroad, the party which Mr. Disraeli established is, at the present juncture, in a commanding position. It has not been so powerful since 1832. And now, when it is at the very crest of the wave, its creator and its leader has determined to leave it to take care of itself. This is the time he has selected to retire, as the Earl of Beaconsfield, into the comparative obscurity of the House of Lords. No one can blame him. In evil days he stood by his party. He led it for nigh forty years through the wilderness of opposition, enjoying only an occasional oasis of power by the way. And now that he has carried it into the Promised Land, and established it there in apparent security, he takes his reward in an earl's coronet. He has lived his life. He is now an old man in impaired health, and he seeks repose in the quiet haven of the House of Lords.

But what effect will his retirement have upon his party? There are many, even of those who sat behind him in the House of Commons, who think that they will do better without him. I have frequently heard some of his supporters assert that they did not regard him but Lord Derby as their leader, and these men probably consider his loss a gain to them. I do not think that they will find it will be so. Mr. Disraeli made mistakes, many of them grotesque, many of them irritating, but he was a man of genius; and through his genius he could keep the House in hand even in its most unruly moments, and, without seeming to do so, he kept up discipline in his party, both in the House of Commons and in the House of Lords. There are two sections of the Tory party: the old territorial section, which works hand in hand with the Church; and the moderate section, which inclines towards the Whig section of the Liberals—the Right and the Right Centre. Mr. Disraeli belonged to neither of these sections, but he had a happy knack of making them pull together. On his imaginative side he was with the Right, and on his rational side he was with the Right Centre, and partly by dexterity, partly by fear—for the most obstreperous Tory feared the cutting force of Mr. Disraeli's words—he made the two sections act as if they were one. He has left no one behind him who can act this part. Lord Granville could do it, but he is a member of the Upper House, and there is no one in the Lower. Already discontent is showing itself in the Tory circles. Sir Stafford Northcote has been appointed leader in the House of Commons, to the chagrin and disappointment of Mr. Gathorne Hardy, who looked for the reversion of the office. He is still loyal, but he has shown a disposition to resent in sullen silence

the selection of his rival. Mr. Hardy represents the Church and territorial section, and Sir Stafford Northcote the moderate section of the party. Mr. Hardy has many sympathizers with him in his resentment, and these sympathizers have nothing to gain by Sir Stafford Northcote's dexterity, and nothing to fear from his epigrams. He is a dull man, without brilliancy or humor, and free even from a suspicion of genius. He will find it no easy task to keep his own party in hand, and an unruly House will laugh him to scorn. We shall see something like a revolt next session, unless I am much mistaken, or, at least, a siding off on the part of the old Tory section under Mr. Hardy from the moderate section under the new leader. And that will be the opportunity for the Opposition. Lord Hartington will be more than a match for Sir Stafford Northcote as a debater, and from his character and prestige he has a much firmer hold upon the House. What he chiefly wants is confidence in himself, and that will come when he feels the power he exercises in the House, and when he is no longer confronted by the tried experience and genius of Mr. Disraeli. Before this time next year, if one may venture to predict, we shall see a marked decline in the position and influence of the Ministry and a corresponding rise in the position and influence of the Opposition. We may see a *rapprochement* between the moderate sections on each side of the House leading in the direction of a coalition; and a coalition might work well enough as a makeshift for a year or two until new questions agitated the country. But whether we have a coalition Ministry or not, Mr. Disraeli's elevation to the peerage may be regarded by his Administration and their supporters as the first milestone on their downward road.

## Correspondence.

### COLLEGE INSTRUCTION IN PHILOSOPHY.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: I have often wished that the *Nation* would devote some space to the condition of philosophy in American colleges. Within the last few years I have visited the class-rooms of many of our best institutions, and believe that there are few if any branches which are so inadequately taught as those generally roughly classed as philosophy. Deductive logic, or the syllogism, is the most thoroughly dwelt upon, while induction, æsthetic and psychological and ethical studies, and especially the history of the leading systems of philosophy, ancient and modern, and the marvellous new developments in England and Germany, are almost entirely ignored. The persistent use of Hamilton, Butler's 'Analogy,' and a score of treatises on "moral science" which deduce all the ground of obligation from theological considerations, as text-books is largely responsible for the supposed unpopularity of the studies.

The application of scientific methods in psychology by Spencer, Lewes, Lotze, Wundt, and others; the admirable text-books now accessible in the general history of philosophy; the application of philosophical systems to history, politics, law, and education, which have contributed to make these subjects centres of such fresh and eager interest under some of the great living German teachers, indicate how entirely our methods of instruction need to be remodelled. I think the success which has attended the recent lecture courses at Cambridge on modern systems of philosophy and on æsthetic studies of literature and the fine arts, shows plainly how much might be accomplished in this direction by the proper method of instruction. This whole field of study is generally given into the hands of one of the older and "safer" members of the faculty, under the erroneous belief that it should be the aim of the professors of this department to indoctrinate rather than to instruct—to tell *what* to think, than to teach *how* to think. When we realize what educational impulses may be awakened in these departments, the loss of time and effort is sadly apparent.

G. S. H.

### A CORRECTION AND LAMENTATION.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: In your issue of the 14th inst. you say (p. 169) that "Butler has been reintroduced to the [Republican] party by the Governor of Massachusetts, in the character in which he masqueraded so long of 'the conqueror of New Orleans.'" The reference is plainly to a speech of W. W. Rice of Worcester, made there on the eve of the Republican State Convention. W. W. Rice is a lawyer and experienced politician, and was last year prominent in the movement to make Charles Francis Adams the Republican nominee for Governor. He will probably succeed Geo. F. Hoar in the next Congress, but is in every way a different man from Alexander H. Rice of

Boston, a business man, thoroughly clean and honorable, with no sympathy for Butler or his works, and who has, as our Governor this year, filled that place so creditably to himself and so satisfactorily to the people that he will certainly receive some votes that would be sure for Mr. Adams at any other time, my own among the number. Let me add that in years like the present, when a Presidential or other important election is before us, and the names of good and honorable men like Hayes and Rice are at the head of our ticket, all the partisans greedy of office seize the opportunity to urge the necessity of "closing up our ranks" and "presenting a united front," lay stress upon their own fidelity to the party, and capture all the nominations for lesser places they can, expecting to share the party success and be carried into place by the full party strength. It does not surprise us, however much we regret it and are ashamed to see it, that at such a time party managers, anxious for the success of their ticket, should look leniently upon General Butler and his kind, and not only hesitate to say anything to "hurt the party," but sometimes become apologists, or perhaps defenders. Why not? They have persuaded themselves that if Tilden is elected President the bloody destruction of the Republic is assured; but if all Congress be composed of tricksters and blackguards, thieves and Butlers, the evil would be but temporary and easily borne. They expect a tree to decay first at the topmost shoot. One thing is certain, this commonwealth will be worse represented in the next Congress than in this, and chiefly, if not solely, because of the numbers who, at a Presidential election, always vote a "straight ticket." What can be done about it?—Yours very truly,

J. C. L.

Boston, Sept. 15, 1876.

[We do not know of anything that "can be done about it" except to try to persuade people to preserve their memory and judgment and morality during the Presidential canvass as during other periods. The power of the managers in throwing voters into a panicky condition during the campaign, and impressing them with the idea that this is their last opportunity of saving the commonwealth, and that the crisis is so serious that every man's duty is to stop questioning and rescue his wife and children and furniture, of course makes the way of thieves and profligates easy. The more the canvass becomes a business affair, conducted on business principles with business forecast, the fewer rascals will profit by it. So long as it is made a kind of "fight in a fair," in which men throw overboard the ordinary prudence, reserves, and experience of ordinary life, and surrender themselves to blind affections, tender memories, and old hates and passions, "Reform" will always be a name merely. Butler's success is due to the wide prevalence of the state of mind which makes "the bloody-shirt" cry successful, and makes people believe that the outrages at the South, which they say have been going on steadily for ten years, will instantly cease if Hayes is elected.—ED. NATION.]

### "THE WIDOW'S" FRIEND.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: I think a paper which professes to be as respectable as yours does ought to be ashamed to publish such a vulgar slur on women as is contained in the last "campaign epigram" on p. 163 of the present volume.

B. PICKMAN MANN.

CAMBRIDGE, MASS., Sept. 18, 1876.

### MR. TILDEN'S "PERJURY."

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: I cannot understand the difficulty you have in dealing with the charge of "perjury" which the *New York Times* and other similar sheets so glibly make against Mr. Tilden. I understand the facts to be, 1st, that he was employed in 1858 to perform certain professional services on behalf of a certain railroad; that the services *thus* and *then* stipulated for were rendered during 1858, 1859, 1860, 1861, and 1862, and that in 1862, shortly after the passing of the Income-Tax Act, he received as his fee for these services \$20,000; 2d, that he returned to the United States Assessor a statement of his income and earnings for the year 1862, in which he declared his income for that year to have been a little less than \$8,000; 3d, that he made no subsequent return of his income, but acquiesced in the penalty imposed by the act for the failure to do so. Upon these facts (I believe I have stated them fully and fairly) it is assumed with confidence, and proclaimed with exultation by the Radical sheets referred to, that Mr. Tilden *must* have



lied either in limiting his income earned and received in 1862 to \$8,000 (I use even numbers), or in stating, as it seems that he did in an answer to a bill in chancery recently filed, that he received \$20,000 as fees from one client in that year; and to my unbounded surprise you profess to see in these facts, without more, a case made out demanding an explanation or defence from Mr. Tilden, in default of which he must stand condemned.

It seems to me that no such inference arises. Of course I am not speaking by authority; I only comment on the matters which are alleged to demonstrate that Mr. Tilden has committed perjury, and, unless I am strangely mistaken, they do nothing of the kind. More than this; they do not even *tend* to show that such a conclusion is probable. It is perfectly consistent with the facts stated that the fee was mainly, perhaps entirely, *earned* in 1858. When a lawyer is retained, his fee, at least *in part*, becomes presently due; sometimes, and not unfrequently, *the whole* of it becomes due immediately upon the accomplishment of a stated end or the performance of a stipulated part of the service. It is also not uncommon that the *actual receipt* of this fee is delayed, "it may be for years, and it may be for ever." If this fee was to become payable immediately on the happening of any event occurring before 1862, or if it was *payable* in 1862 on account of services rendered prior to that year, it could in neither case be considered as part of the income *earned* by Mr. Tilden in 1862. Even if paid in 1862 on account of services running uniformly through '58, '59, '60, '61, and half of '62, it is easy to see that for only about one-eighth or one-ninth of the sum would Mr. Tilden have been accountable as income earned in the year 1862; and there is nothing in the facts stated which raises the faintest presumption that this proportion of \$20,000 (amounting to \$2,500 or \$2,222 22) was not actually thus accounted for in the return which he appears to have then made.

I had been absent from home for two months, during which time I had seen and smiled at the charge made by the *New York Times*, but a *defence* of Mr. Tilden, attempted by the *Chicago Times*, appeared to me a more serious and more damaging matter. In that journal two answers were made to the charge. One was, substantially, that the income tax was odious, unjust, and un-American, its assessment and collection being connected with highly inquisitorial proceedings, and that every one was absolved from the ordinary obligations of morality when dealing with such a tax; the other was, that it was more than probable if the income returns of Mr. Hayes and Mr. Morgan could be scrutinized that they would show similar suppressions of the truth! It was the old reply: "You're another." From such defenders may Heaven defend all honest men! On returning home, however, I find that you seem to be of the opinion that the charge rests on something requiring explanation, at least. In all fairness, is this the case? Is it not rather true that from the matters alleged no possible implication of impropriety arises?

The lofty, independent, and candid course during this canvass of your paper (of which I have been a constant reader for more than seven years) not only contrasts refreshingly with that of the great bulk of your contemporaries, but sets them an example to which, though they may affect to deride it now, they will sooner or later be compelled to conform. \*\*\*

St. Louis, Mo., Sept. 9, 1876.

[This explanation will not cover the additions to his income which Mr. Tilden received from other sources, and which have been shown to be considerable; and we may add that we think enough has now been said on this subject by other people than Mr. Tilden. We have been placed in a position of some difficulty, both with regard to this and other questions arising in this campaign, by the great diversity of opinion among our correspondents. For example, we received last week a letter from the head of one of the oldest and most respectable mercantile houses in New York, entirely approving of Mr. Tilden's decision to make no return of his income during the later years of the tax, and suffer the penalty; or, at all events, treating it as a blameless or colorless act. By the same mail we received from Mr. Albert Small, of Maryland, also an honorable man, a letter in which he compared it to murder committed by a person who has made up his mind to gratify his hate and bear the prescribed punishment. We feel that if we differed with either of these respectable readers we should lose the good opinion of the other, so we have resolved on a middle course. That is, considering the badness of Tilden's war record, the importance of this election, and the dangers of a Democratic restoration, we are willing to liken his refusal to make a return, to highway robbery in day-

light. We confess we cannot see our way to comparing it to murder without flight or concealment, conscious though we be of his defects as a candidate. We ought to add that this offer will only remain open until the first Monday of November. On the following day we shall return, on this as on all other matters, to the old scale of morality.—ED. NATION.]

#### "TRANSCENDENTALISM."

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: As I read your review of Mr. Frothingham's History of New England "Transcendentalism," I was inclined to ask whether those of us who accept the principles of that system are quite as great fools as we are there represented to be. You (or your reviewer in your name) tell us, in a decisive way, that our belief in some intuitive insights is only the effete superstition of the African sorcerer, revived in a new form. Your reason for saying this is, that both the African sorcerer and the Transcendentalist believe some spiritual facts to be true which neither of us can prove. Transcendentalists assert that there is something infallible in instinct; something divine in conscience; some faculty which enables us to know the truth when we see it. This assertion you call "a pretentious dogma," which requires "a little saintly patience" even to be considered. We believe that there are objective realities corresponding to these mental insights. This you characterize as a "monstrous" addition to Kant's philosophy, and the "resurrection of an effete superstition." This sentence upon our views is uttered with such a supreme air of sacerdotal infallibility that it is somewhat imposing. Still, we will venture to ask whether it is absolutely certain that we are the living representatives of the fetish-worshipper, or not?

One of your reasons for classing us with the African sorcerer is that we believe in "the possession of a faculty which, transcending experience, enables us to know truth when we see it." This you call "a pretentious dogma." I have always supposed that there were axioms in mathematics as well as in philosophy which we know to be true when we see them. What amount of experience is necessary to know that a straight line is the shortest distance between two points? That there is intuitive knowledge, or a sight of truth in itself, is conceded even by those who refer such axioms as the above to experience. Mr. Mill says that "truths are known in two ways: some are known directly and of themselves, some through the medium of other truths. The former are the subject of intuition or consciousness; the latter, of inference. The truths known by intuition are the original premises from which all others are inferred." Is Mr. Mill's position, therefore, identical "with the old superstition of supernatural communications"? And if not, what is the objection to our saying that we know truth when we see it?

Again, you call it "a monstrous" addition to Kant's philosophy that we believe in objective realities corresponding to our intuitive perceptions. You say that in this we attribute "amazing properties" to the human mind. But this belief also, if not held by Kant, has been that of the great majority of thinkers in all times. The doctrine of the purely phenomenal character of knowledge is an exceptional opinion, not the prevailing one. Even Bacon, who is not usually classed with idealists, says that the truths of knowing and of being are identical ("Veritas essendi et veritas cognoscendi idem sunt"); and certainly the great mass of men believe in the objective reality of their own existence, as well as in that of the outward world, with no better reason for it than that they know it to be so.

It is not my purpose to enter into metaphysical questions which are in debate between sensationalists and idealists. I must, however, protest against your assumption that these questions have been finally settled, without appeal, in favor of the former.

There are some writers of our time who, having been brought up on the philosophy of experience, hastily conclude that all other systems of thought are for ever exploded. Your reviewer somewhat naïvely expresses his surprise and indignation because the intuitive faith of mankind should refuse to remain dead, after having been so cleverly put out of the way by Mill and Spencer and Lewes and the other teachers of their kind. I fear that he is destined to encounter many other similar surprises. Transcendentalism, in some form, is as old as human thought, and will never die. A wave of temporary popularity may place the philosophy which deduces all our knowledge from sensation in the advance, but the oscillation of thought will soon bring men back to the faith of the greatest thinkers of their race.

Yours,

JAMES FREEMAN CLARKE.

Boston, September 11, 1876.

[Without entering into any metaphysical discussion, we must

point out to Mr. Clarke that he has apparently misunderstood Mill's position. Nothing can be clearer than Mill's denial of any perception of truth flowing from the constitution of the mind. His celebrated discussion with Dr. Whewell was on this very point. The axioms of the demonstrative sciences are, he says, "experimental truths," and what he means by "intuitive truths" is simply truths which are "an induction from the evidence of our senses," the senses having previously gone through a process of investigation, and "intuition" being simply "imaginary looking." He nowhere gives any countenance to the idea that there is in the mind itself a fountain of truth.

We must also draw Mr. Clarke's attention to the fact that we have not called "belief in objective realities corresponding to our intuitive perceptions" a "monstrous addition to Kant's philosophy." Our words are that Kant "never affirmed the existence of any objective realities corresponding to the ideas of the 'transcendental faculties,'" which is a very different thing; and we took the "transcendental faculties" as described by Messrs. Theodore Parker and Frothingham, or in Mr. Frothingham's language, as "the immanence of the divinity in instinct, the transference of supernatural attributes to the natural constitution of mankind." This is unquestionably "a monstrous addition to Kant," and we must oppose to Mr. Clarke's assertion that "this belief has been that of a majority of thinkers in all times" a simple denial.

As regards the future of Transcendentalism, we have no doubt Mr. Clarke is right when he says it will last for ever. As a form of attractive speculation, we do not know that anybody has a right to object to his neighbor's pursuing it in his own mind. What will not last for ever, and is rapidly disappearing, is the use of "the divinity in instinct," or each man's "consciousness of the conscience of God," in the regulation of human society. In the field of sociology the ground won by experience is won for ever. The government of popes, or priests, or prophets, or "medicine-men," and of persons who find out what is right and just in their relations with their fellow-men by looking in and not out, is surely destined to extinction at no distant day.—ED. NATION.]

#### THE NATION AND PROFESSOR MAX MÜLLER.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: The *Nation*, in reviewing the fourth volume of Müller's 'Chips from a German Workshop,' March 23, 1876, charged him with *intentionally* interpolating an important clause in a quotation from his own writings for the purpose of disguising its original meaning. As a "characteristic specimen" "of the manner in which Professor Müller quotes from his own writings," there is furnished the following, with preface and comments:

"To show that as long ago as 1851 he [Professor Müller] was no stranger to the correct distinction between vowels and consonants, he quotes from his 'Proposals for a Missionary Alphabet,' published in that year, as follows: 'If we regard the human voice as a continuous stream of air, emitted as breath from the lungs, and changed [by the vibration of the *chordæ vocales*] into vocal sound as it leaves the larynx, this stream itself, as modified by certain positions of the mouth, would represent the vowels. In the consonants, on the contrary, we should have to recognize a number of stops, opposing for a moment the free passage of this vocal air.' In quoting this passage, Professor Müller has interpolated the words which we have enclosed in brackets, and substituted at the close vocal *air* for vocal *stream*, with the obvious design of disguising its real sense."

Such is the charge. Now for the truth. There were two editions of Müller's 'Proposals for a Missionary Alphabet,' the first published in 1854, the second *early* in 1855. The second edition was revised, changed in many particulars, and greatly enlarged. Professor Müller quotes from this second edition, and does not interpolate. The second edition has the passage exactly as given in the 'Chips,' and here reproduced, except that *air* at the close is substituted for *stream*; but as that word stands for "stream of *air*" above, it makes no change in the sense, and is an error peculiarly liable to arise from a slip of the pen.

W.

[We reopen this controversy with reluctance, but our correspondent is somewhat urgent and we shall attempt to satisfy him. We

own with no little chagrin that we were simple-minded enough to take for granted that Professor Müller was here quoting, as he professed to quote, from the edition of his 'Proposals' published in 1854. For such uncommonly sharp practice as an examination of the second edition now first discovers to us, we were quite unprepared. The quotation ('Chips,' vol. iv., p. 492) is introduced thus: "This was in 1866, whereas in 1854 I had said: 'If we regard the human voice, etc.'" He quotes, however, from the second edition, giving it (for reasons which will presently appear) the date of the first. On the very next page (493) he again refers in the following manner to the same work:

"I do not object to the use of *surd* or *sonant*. I have used these terms from the very beginning of my literary career, and as Professor Whitney evidently doubts my word, I may refer him to my 'Proposals' submitted to the Alphabetical Conferences in 1854. He will find that as early as that date I already used *sonant*, though, like Pott, I explained this new term by the more familiar *soft*."

Here Professor Müller is forced to abandon the edition from which he had just quoted for the first, for the reason that in the second edition he had already repented of his use of the terms *surd* and *sonant*, and had dropped them. Thus, in the passage quoted in our review, instead of "the consonant is called *tennis*, hard or *surd*," "media, soft or *sonant*," the second edition reads "*tennis* or hard," "soft, or, according to classical terminology, media or middle." The error in our former statement, which no one will now suspect to have been intentional, we cheerfully correct. It was not by the rule of *interpolation* but by that of *double position* that Professor Müller proceeded in solving his puzzle.

The other, and certainly not less grave, part of our accusation—that Professor Müller in his 'Proposals' advanced very crude and erroneous views, which he has since abandoned, in regard to the distinction of vowel and consonant, *surd* and *sonant*, and that the passage quoted had there a very different meaning from that which he intends it to convey in 'Chips'—is as true of the second edition as of the first. The passage which we cited in proof of this, and which could easily be fortified by others if there were need, underwent no change in the second edition beyond the unfortunate dropping of the terms *surd* and *sonant*, which we have already alluded to. To aid any who may care to make a further comparison of the editions, we add that the 'Proposals for a Missionary Alphabet submitted to the Alphabetical Conferences held at the residence of Chevalier Bunsen, in January, 1854,' were laid in printed form before the Conferences, and were also inserted as an appendix to the fourth volume of Bunsen's 'Christianity and Mankind,' published the same year. The second edition was joined as an appendix to the second edition of Müller's 'Survey of the Languages of the Seat of War in the East' (London, 1855), and also, we believe, issued separately. It is worthy of remark that, though considerably altered and enlarged, neither the title-page nor the preface of the second edition gives any hint of change.—ED. NATION.]

#### Notes.

J. H. COATES & CO., Philadelphia, have in press 'Essays in Literary Criticism,' by Richard Holt Hutton, senior editor of the *London Spectator*. The subjects of these essays—writers "who have indeed lived with me and in me," as the author says in his preface—are Goethe, Hawthorne, Clough, Wordsworth, George Eliot, and Matthew Arnold. Messrs. Coates & Co. also publish shortly Mrs. Leonowens's 'Life and Travel in India,' with illustrations.—J. B. Lippincott & Co. are now able to furnish complete sets or single volumes of Schoolcraft's 'Archives of Aboriginal Knowledge.'—A clever artist, Mr. J. Keppler, with a happy knack at likeness in caricature, is to be the main reliance of a new German comic weekly, *Puck*, which makes its appearance next Saturday in this city (Keppler & Schwarzmann). If we remember aright, a similar journal was formerly published, under the same name, in St. Louis, with Mr. Keppler for artist.—The National Reform League announce their intention of issuing an occasional periodical devoted to the aims of the society, and that as soon as arrangements can be made a civil-reform congress will be held



under its auspices. Mr. R. Heber Newton, P. O. box 1749, New York City, is the editor of the periodical in question; G. P. Putnam's Sons, the publishers.—The American Metric Bureau, 13 Tremont Place, Boston, issues monthly bulletins of metric "items" to such newspapers as are willing to reproduce them.—We have received a well-executed 'Mineral Map of New South Wales,' a Government publication, designed to promote immigration, and for that purpose accompanied by statistics calculated to appeal not only to Britons but to Americans who wish to better their fortunes. Certainly if mineral wealth and grazing capacity were sufficient attractions, the country could well compete with almost any other. The fact that Australia's subdivisions are, and are likely to be, few and of larger area than any of the States of our Union, is noticed as "a geographical difference that may involve important political differences."

—Among the numerous contributions of the present year to Fourth of July oratory, that of Mr. Theodore Bacon at Palmyra, N. Y., is one of the few which have attracted far less attention than they deserved. For suggestiveness and individuality of treatment it excels anything we have seen. He confines himself to the discussion of "certain limitations upon national self-laudation," and treats them with great good taste and skill. Entering fully into the spirit of the day, and detracting nothing from the country's just claims to glory, he yet proceeds to suggest some very pregnant enquiries. During the century we are now closing, what have other nations been doing? While we have progressed have they been standing still? Then briefly taking up each point on which we rest our claims for progress, he applies to it the results brought about elsewhere—in England, in France, in Germany. He avoids making comparisons; he merely suggests them. The result is certainly very profitable centennial reading, and cooling withal to national vanity.

—About five years ago, on the occasion of a celebration at Duxbury, Mass., we were impelled to point out how little was known about Capt. Miles Standish, in whose honor the affair was held. What is known of the American career of the doughty warrior is to be seen in the standard histories; the poetic fables of his modern admirers are beyond enumeration. In the *Catholic World* for August we find some eleven pages given to a discussion of the following question: "Was Miles Standish a Catholic?" and the desire of the enquirer is evidently to answer it in the affirmative. The writer starts with two facts: first, that Standish did not join the Plymouth Church; secondly, that the English family of Standish, both the branch at Standish and that at Duxbury, are and have been Catholic. Between these he interposes the fact that Miles in his will says that his grandfather was a "second or younger brother of the house of Standish of Standish." Hence he argues that the concealed cause of Miles's indifference to Puritanism was his inherited belief in the Catholic faith. But herein are two serious errors in argument. Miles was born in 1584, and was contemporary with Edward Standish, who built Standish Hall in 1574, and who died in 1603. Edward was son of Alexander and grandson of Ralph Standish, the latter dying in 1538, aged 80. This Ralph and his presumed younger brother (grandfather of Miles) were sons of Sir Alexander Standish. Now, the accepted authorities show an uninterrupted descent of the family estates, so that it is hard to see how the grandfather of Miles was defrauded of any property; and as we know not the name of his father or his grandfather, the pedigree is too shadowy for acceptance. Miles *may* have been one of the younger branches of the tree, but he must suffer because he has not left the means of proof. It is a suggestive fact that Duxbury in Massachusetts revives the name not of this line of Standishes of Standish but of that at Duxbury Hall, which branched off as early as A.D. 1270. We must, therefore, first insist that there is no *proof* that Miles belonged to this line of Standishes. Secondly, as his nearest point of connection was the Sir Alexander who died in 1507, or at the outside the Ralph who died in 1538, what warrant is there that the special line of Miles's ancestors remained true to the Catholic Church? Evidently none; and accepting the English Reformation as bearing date about 1535, it probably occurred during the life of Miles's grandfather. Remembering how the nation was divided on religious affairs and the fluctuations under Edward, Mary, and Elizabeth, clearly no man's religious views can be reasonably inferred from those of any of his relatives. The writer truly urges that Miles, if a Catholic, did not serve probably in the Protestant forces, and would thus leave it in doubt where he received his military instruction. But if a Protestant, he might have served, as is usually said, in the Low Countries. There is, therefore, nothing in all the assumptions and suggestions of the *Catholic World*. There is no proof that Miles belonged to a Catholic family; not the faintest reason for arguing that if he were so connected he was a Catholic. Every one of those who did remain Catholic in

England must have had hundreds of Protestant cousins. That Miles was not a church-member is true; but was there no alternative but Catholicism? He may have been a moderate churchman, or merely indifferent on the subject. In either case he could have lived without offence at Plymouth. But no reason is suggested why a Catholic should have deprived himself of those Church ministrations so essential to his salvation for the sake of joining the Pilgrims. Briefly our answer is this: Was Standish a Catholic? We do not know; we can only ask as an equally unanswerable question, Was he a Brahman?

—The question, "Are we Drying Up?" is discussed by Professor J. D. Whitney in the *American Naturalist* for September without the usual anathemas against the lumber trade. Those who have witnessed the ravages of forest fires on the hillsides of New England and elsewhere, doubt the comprehensiveness of writers who ascribe much importance to the slow movements of the axe. Time would more profitably be spent in enquiring into the causes of these fires than in deprecating the cutting down of trees. We cannot suppose that many of the fires are spontaneous. The chief responsibility for them is frequently ascribed to the locomotive; but the hunter, the camper-out, and the smoker have doubtless much to answer for. However this may be, the popular notion that such wholesale destruction affects the quantity of rainfall, Professor Whitney regards as very much at variance with the results of European investigation. Undue weight has been attached to recent meteorological statistics, which, in such a consideration, are too narrow and too brief to be serviceable. Records of the height of the waters of rivers are more significant. Such records have been kept at several points in Europe, and they show that the Danube, Rhine, Elbe, and other rivers have for many years been carrying a constantly diminishing quantity of water, and that there is reason to apprehend that they will eventually disappear from the list of navigable rivers of Germany. But all grounds for investigating the possible causative agency of wood-cutting in relation to this diminution seem to be removed from under us when we realize that records eclipsing in magnitude all those kept by the hands of men exist in the terraces surrounding the lakes and rivers of the Humboldt Basin, and other parts of America; terraces which indicate that the period during which the process of desiccation has been going on far antedates the invention of edged tools by men. Recent explorations in Central Asia also show that the areas of several great lakes have been vastly curtailed. In view of these facts it would seem that the hypothesis of the influence of forests upon evaporation and rainfall must be set aside, and that we must look for some grander cause whose scale shall correspond with such effects. Setting speculative causes aside, such as the possible variation in the central heat beneath the earth's crust, there is one well-known cause which, we think, can scarcely be demonstrated to be incapable of producing the desiccation. The sun's heat is notoriously the source of all climates, and changes in the amount of heat radiated from the sun are now regarded as causing the changes in terrestrial weather. It is therefore reasonable to ascribe our drying-up, since it requires ages for its completion, to a change in the solar cause requiring also a long cycle for its fulfilment, provided that astronomy gives us proof of any such change. And astronomy does tell us of two such cycles: one in the obliquity of the ecliptic, and one in the perihelion distance of the earth from the sun, both cycles being results of planetary perturbations of the earth's orbit. The effect of the second of these cycles is too abstruse to explain here; the first is simpler. As the angle between the plane of the earth's equator and that of her orbit diminishes, the limits of the torrid zone also diminish, inasmuch as that zone is bounded by the tropics which are determined by the angle in question. The region, then, over which the sun is occasionally vertical is being narrowed. An obvious result of this narrowing would seem to be an intensification of the equatorial phenomena of trade-winds, heat, and rainfall within the torrid zone, and a corresponding loss of heat and of precipitation in the extra-tropical zones.

—The salient article in the September-October number of the *International Review* is Mr. Freeman's paper on Macaulay. After saying that all students and writers of any period of English history ought to feel the deepest gratitude to Macaulay, and to look up to him as "a master and a model," Mr. Freeman proceeds: "First of all, Macaulay is a model of style—not merely as a kind of literary luxury, but of style in its practical aspect." Not that he should be copied, "but every one who wishes to write clear and pure English will do well to become not Macaulay's ape, but Macaulay's disciple. Every writer of English will do well . . . very often to ask himself . . . whether his writing is such as Macaulay would have approved. I know at least what my own experience is. It is for others to judge whether I have learned of Macaulay the art of

being clear; I at least learned from Macaulay the duty of trying to be clear." The whole of this passage on style is worthy of careful perusal. Mr. Freeman next points out the limitations of Macaulay's information and his lack of love for certain periods of history, and declares that in all his work, even in his introductory sketch of earlier English history—for which he clearly had no liking—he shows a "thorough grasp of the order of causes and events, and of the bearing which the events of one age had on the next, . . . the grasp which the true historian has even over the times which he has not studied in detail." Reference is then made to the breaks in Macaulay's learning; it is noted, for instance, that "he leaped from the fourth century to the sixteenth," and that, being a man of the eighteenth century, he had "something of the eighteenth-century contempt for mediæval times and things." Mr. Freeman ends his instructive and suggestive article with an admission that Macaulay was pre-scientific:

"Yet he was a great scholar, a great writer, a great historian, a great man. Those who can most clearly see his real faults are those who know his writings best, and who therefore admire them most. And those who know them best and admire them most will also be the first to mark what cannot fairly be called faults those gaps in the way of looking at things which belong to the man and his time, as other gaps of the same kind doubtless belong to other men and other times. Macaulay is a man who already belongs to a past age; but without such men in past ages, the present age could not have been what they have helped to make it."

Mr. Freeman must wince when he sees what proof-reading his manuscript has been subjected to by the *Revisor*. His pet way of spelling Edred and Elgar is converted into "Gadrel" and "Gadgar," and Sir James Stephen appears as "Sir Jere Stephen"!

—In *Harper's Monthly* for October the novelette, the serial tale (there are no less than three, from "Daniel Deronda" down—a great way down—to "Garth"), and the time-honored résumé of works published by the Messrs. Harper occupy most of the space. Outside of these, American geography is cultivated in "The Silver Mountains of Utah," picturesquely illustrated; local history in "Newark"; science in a second and very interesting paper on the "Carnivorous Plants of Florida," by Mrs. Mary Treat, who tells with pen and pencil of the pitcher-plant; and biography in Mr. James Payn's brief sketch of the late Harriet Martineau. Nothing more pleasing than this tribute to the great Englishwoman, of all that has been written about her, has fallen under our notice. Mr. Payn knew her intimately, and judges her impartially, but with undisguised affection for her sweet and womanly character. The portrait which accompanies the article is an unsuccessful enlargement from a photograph, showing her at her knitting, taken in the last years of her solitary life. Mrs. Lamb, perhaps, does not do quite as much for Newark as she did for Lyme; but in more than one respect this great manufacturing city gives her an opportunity for the use of flattering superlatives. Its New England, and even, we may say, its Connecticut and Puritan, origin is reflected in the fact that, to quote our author, "the records of the Patent-Office show that Newark has contributed more useful inventions to industrial progress than any other American city." Its public schools, too, have something of the New England excellence; but in general the city is not remarkable for intellectual activity. Mrs. Lamb did all that conscience would allow to courtesy when she wrote of the New Jersey Historical Society's library that it is "a favorite resort for scholars." There is, in fact, a sad lack of life in the Society, and, if more than one New England State library that we might name is equally buried under undisturbed dust, on the other hand more than one Southern or Western society offers a reproachful contrast to its inertness.

—There can be little doubt that the Danube is, for many years to come, to be the seat of the political preoccupations of Europe. Whatever the immediate result of the conflict now raging, time spent in studying the character of the Turks and of her more or less dependent Christian populations will assuredly not be lost. For what concerns the Turks one need not seek the most recent histories. The essential character of their government, both in peace and war, is not otherwise portrayed, for instance, in Stillman's 'Cretan Insurrection of 1866' than in Pouqueville's 'Régénération de la Grèce,' which preceded it by half a century. The only difference to be noted is the repressive influence nowadays of foreign powers on the natural outcome of Oriental despotism. The late atrocities in Bulgaria exactly resemble those recorded by Ali Pasha's biographer; but in his time there was no way of bringing public opinion to bear on them, even if the facts came to light in season, and even, to speak paradoxically, if there had been any "public opinion." No great change, either, has occurred in the character of the Christian subjects of Turkey; but their condition, their increase in wealth and numbers, their geographical environment, their race affiliations, their religion and manners, have assumed a new

interest since the recent rapid progress of the European idea of nation-lities. We find in the August number of the *Polybiblion* a tolerably long list of works relating to Bulgaria which have appeared in the last three years. Omitting such as are not accessible in the French or German, we select the following: 'Donau-Bulgarien und der Balkan,' by F. Kanitz, an Austrian consul, is a worthy pendant of the same author's 'Serbien,' which was published in sumptuous style in 1868, and is the highest authority in regard to the geography, history, and ethnography of that principality. The present work is but half finished, but it happens to deal with the northwestern corner of Bulgaria, which has been the scene of so much unavailing bloodshed from Widin to Nissa. The history of Bulgaria is more singly and profoundly treated by a Bohemian scholar, Constantin Jirecek, from whom one may obtain not only light on the vexed question of the colonization of the Balkan peninsula, but some idea of ancient and recent Bulgarian literature. He has recomposed his work in German, and a French version is promised. On the literary side we have also the 'Chansons populaires bulgares inédites' of Auguste Dozon, in which, beside the original poetry, is placed a French translation, with notes and a complete glossary. Finally, for a sober view of the present situation of Turkey, her dependencies, and her neighbors, *Polybiblion* recommends the work of a Belgian officer, Franz Crousse, entitled, 'La Péninsule gréco-slave, son passé, son présent, et son avenir.' It is the product of much research, has appendices, ethnographic and statistical tables, and a map, and will be prized also for its reference to authorities consulted.

#### CARLYLE'S EARLY KINGS OF NORWAY.\*

A MELANCHOLY interest belongs to this volume, for it is avowedly the last of Carlyle. 'The Early Kings of Norway' has been convicted of inaccuracies, both with regard to Norse history and with regard to the history of England with which the Norse history is connected. But Carlyle is not a profound historical enquirer, nor can his works, as a rule, lay claim to the special credit of works of research. They are historical illustrations of his philosophy. Regarded as such, they are not wanting in accuracy, and they are entirely free from the mendacity (we can call it by no more lenient name) which, as the literary world begins already to see, is characteristic of his principal imitator, Mr. Froude. You will never catch Carlyle wilfully misstating a fact or garbling a quotation. He tells you everything honestly, to the best of his knowledge. But he more or less perverts and distorts everything, both to his own eye and to that of his reader, by steeping the whole in the colors of his special philosophy.

That philosophy remains unchanged, and furnishes the keynote of this as it did of previous and more elaborately philosophic volumes. For the last thirty years, at least, Carlyle has been what he himself calls "a shut-up man," totally incapable of listening to argument or of reconsidering and qualifying his opinions. Changed his personal position in English politics has been. He has grown, like other Liberals of impulse, Tory in his old age; and the scorn which, in 'Sartor Resartus,' 'Past and Present,' and 'Latter-Day Pamphlets,' he poured on ducal costermongers and a game-preserving aristocracy has given place to accents of what, if we did not know the man, we should call adulation. But the philosophy remains the same. Its leading principles, or rather sentiments, are all reaffirmed in the epilogue to 'The Early Kings of Norway,' under the form of a quotation from Ruskin's crazy 'Fors Clavigera,' so Carlylese that, had Ruskin's name not been expressly affixed to it, we should certainly have taken it to be Carlyle's own:

"My friends, the follies of modern Liberalism, many and great though they be, are practically summed in this denial or neglect of the quality and intrinsic value of things. Its rectangular beatitudes and spherical benevolences—theology of universal indulgence and jurisprudence which will hang no rogues—mean, one and all of them, in the root, incapacity of discerning or refusal to discern worth from unworth in everything, and most of all in man. Your main problem is that ancient and trite one, 'Who is best man?' and the Fates forgive much—forgive the wildest, fiercest, cruellest experiments—if fairly made for the determination of that. Theft and bloodguiltiness are not pleasing in their sight; yet the favoring powers of the spiritual and material world will confirm to you your stolen goods, and their noblest voices applaud the lifting of your spear, and rehearse the sculpture on your shield, if only your robbing and slaying have been in fair arbitrament of the question, 'Who is best man?' But if you refuse such enquiry and maintain every man for his neighbor's match—if you give votes to the simple and liberty to the vile, the powers of those spiritual and material worlds in due time present you inevitably with the same problem, soluble now only wrong side upwards; and your robbing and slaying must be done, then, to find out 'Who is worst man'; which, in so wide an order of merit, is, indeed, not easy; but a complete Tammany

\* 'The Early Kings of Norway. Also, an Essay on the Portraits of John Knox. By Thomas Carlyle.' New York: Harper & Brothers.



Ring, and lowest circle in the Inferno of Worst, you are sure to find and to be governed by."

It is impossible to repress a smile at the picture of Mr. Ruskin panting for a state of things under which the question "Who is the best man?" should be tried by the heroic methods of material robbing and slaying. We wonder what he thinks his own lot, or even that of Mr. Carlyle, would be. Sons of a refined and sentimental civilization, what can be more grotesque than their sighing for barbarism? In this passage, however, are summed, as we have said, what we take to be the leading principles or, still to use the more appropriate word, sentiments, of the Carlyle philosophy—hatred of democracy, hatred of philanthropy; hero-worship; and preference of the past to the present.

At the birth of democracy, the optimist view naturally prevailed as to the capacity of the people for self-government. It prevails still among certain enthusiasts, especially in countries where the struggle against the powers of the old régime is still going on. Perhaps the illusion was necessary as a stimulant to the effort by which the world disengaged itself from feudalism and despotism. But among rational people, and in countries where the struggle is over, the illusion as to the perfect wisdom and goodness of the sovereign people has ceased, or is fast ceasing, to exist. Democracy is seen to be an experiment which the world could not help making, despotism and feudalism being effete, and which is full of the hope of far better things for humanity than despotism or feudalism, when at their best, ever produced, but which is also an arduous experiment, and one full of labor and peril for this generation, and probably for many generations to come. In opposition to the optimist view, Carlyle has presented the pessimist view. He has presented it with great vigor, with much grotesque picturesqueness, and probably not without effect. But the pessimist view is at least as false as the optimist view, and at least as noxious, if taken as the rule for our practice. Falsehood is not to be displaced by falsehood, but only by that of which Carlyle, with all his high sympathies and sincerity of feeling, is incapable—an exact statement of the real truth. The incessant reiteration of "twenty-seven millions, mostly fools" is taken by everybody for what it is—not a fact, but a joke. Moreover, the world knows and, after amusing itself with the cynicism of Carlyle, acts upon the knowledge, that the century which has passed since the birth of democracy has, in spite of all the abortive revolutions, the demagogism, flummery, blunders, crimes, and disappointments, been incomparably the most fruitful of all centuries in real progress and increase of genuine happiness.

Carlyle's denunciations of modern philanthropy seem to us both to have less to justify them than his denunciations of democracy and to have done far less good. On what they are founded we hardly know, mercy and loving kindness not being, as it appears to us, dangerously prevalent on earth. The only practical instance of excessive philanthropy to which Carlyle has ever pointed are the model prisons; but it is remarkable that by another writer of social fiction, Mr. Charles Reade, these same model prisons have been painted as dens of the most hideous cruelty. The fact is, that the system being new and the characters of its administrators various, there are over-indulgence, though to nothing like the extent imagined by Mr. Carlyle in some cases, and cruelty, though to nothing like the extent imagined by Mr. Charles Reade in other cases; both excesses being local accidents, not parts of the system, much less signs of the spirit of the age. The reform of the criminal law may have overshot the mark in some respects—all extensive reforms do—but, on the whole, the economy of punishment has been justified by its results, not only in the diminution of suffering, but in the reduced amount of crime. That golden age of England, according to Mr. Froude, when 70,000 people were hanged in a single reign, must either have been an age of wholesale injustice or an age prolific in offences which deserve the gallows. One of the least agreeable passages in Carlyle's works is that in which he sneers at Howard. In a passage of his 'Frederick' he seems, though we hope not deliberately, to regret the abolition of torture. Of course, he is outrun by his disciples, Froude and Ruskin, the first of whom revels in the heroic Tudor practice of boiling people alive, while the second thought it part of his mission to stimulate the vindictive thirst for blood after the suppression of the mutiny in India—a somewhat superfluous proceeding, since Lord Elgin, who shortly afterwards was Governor-General, has intimated his belief that the English reign of terror at Delhi was worse than the massacre under Nadir Shah. On the other hand, it is instructive to compare Mr. Carlyle's rhapsodies of exultation over the massacres at Drogheda and Wexford with Cromwell's own despatch, which at least breathes sentiments of humane regret. Cromwell was too strong to be inhuman. Anti philanthropy, as well as excessive philanthropy, is sentimentality, not principle. It is Rousseauism turned upside down. Mr. Froude, in his 'Shadows of the Clouds,' resolves,

Rousseau-like, all crime into adverse circumstances; in his history, he exults in judicial murder and he wants to boil criminals alive.

As to hero-worship, what is it? In the name of common sense, what is it? Can it be good for us to blind ourselves, as Mr. Carlyle in his biographies of heroes invariably does, to the weaknesses and faults of great men? Can we hope to be saved by an illusion, or, as Carlyle would say, by a lie? It is very foolish and very dangerous to take a ballot-box for a universal regenerator. But is it a whit less foolish or less dangerous to take a man for a god? Construing Mr. Carlyle's sayings literally, or anything like literally, we should be led to suppose that our one hope of political salvation lay in renouncing the guidance of reason, conscience, and experience, whether individual or collective, to set out in a body in quest of a bell-wether. Would any one in his senses seriously recommend us to do so? And what are the marks of the bell-wether? How are we to know the hero? Looking to the list of heroes given us by Carlyle, what common attributes of leadership do we find in Odin, Mahomet, Shakspeare, Dante, Cromwell, Rousseau, Goethe, Luther, Dr. Johnson, Napoleon, Frederic the Great, Dr. Francia, and, we suppose we must add, Governor Eyre? Those in the list who were rulers, and for whom political obedience might be reasonably challenged, such as Cromwell and Napoleon, rose to leadership through convulsions and wars. Is society to throw itself into convulsions and wars that leaders may emerge? Something of heroism, says Carlyle in one place, is needed to discern a hero. If so, how are heroes to be discerned by the "twenty-seven millions, mostly fools"? At the moment of transition from the hereditary principle to that of reason as the basis of government there was a natural tendency to overrate the powers of political science, which found its most extravagant and grotesque expression in the reveries of Sieyès. It was supposed that good government could be assured by mechanical arrangements and divisions of power, apart from the qualities of men. So far as hero-worship is a protest against this tendency it is good, but we can hardly believe that its preacher himself seriously regards it as a practical principle and a basis of government.

Carlyle's preference of the past to the present is closely connected with his hero-worship. The past was the time of heavy lists; it was also the time of individual predominance, while the tendency of progress is to raise the general level of humanity. Carlyle has no idea of the general movement of history, or of anything like evolution; the days of Odin are to him as the days of Governor Eyre. But it is difficult to understand how he can have written his own 'Past and Present' without being awakened to the fact that the era of King John and the Jewish usurers of St. Edmundsbury was not much happier or more heroic than our own.

The practical application by Carlyle himself of his philosophy has consisted in violent demonstrations in favor of Southern slavery and of Governor Eyre; in the first of which cases, at all events, that which, according to Carlyle, was the right, has not proved identical with the might. The only third instance we know of his practical intervention in politics is the call, in 'Latter-Day Pamphlets,' for the restoration to power of Sir Robert Peel. Nothing could be better or more beneficial to the whole country than the renewal of a wise, moderate, and upright administration; but if there ever was a public man who did not correspond to Carlyle's ideal of a hero it was the cautious, constitutional, and somewhat formal Sir Robert Peel.

It is a different thing when we come to speak of what we may call the hortative parts of Carlyle—his inculcation of high moral aims, and of the preference of duty to happiness. Often he is a great and salutary preacher. The only thing we miss here is a definite basis. What does Carlyle mean by "duty"? What does he mean by "God"?

The case is still more altered in Carlyle's favor when we come to speak of the literary expression of his philosophy, and, above all, of its embodiment in history or biography. It is needless to dwell on the literary merits of 'Sartor Resartus' or 'The French Revolution.' In interest, in vividness, in narrative power, in poetry, in the almost Shakspearean faculty of blending the humorous with the tragic, some passages of 'Cromwell' and 'Frederic the Great' equal 'The French Revolution'; though, as a whole, these books are more marred by the exaggeration, the sophistry, the perversions of historical justice which the worship of a fallible and faulty man as an infallible and faultless hero inevitably demands. 'The Early Kings of Norway' does not fail to exhibit traces of the same genius. Taking the work of his life as a whole, no doubt the veteran sage of Chelsea may look forward confidently to admission into the literary Pantheon. If, on account of the partial falsehood of his philosophy and the historical injustice into which he has been thereby betrayed, he should be condemned previously to undergo a short term of Purgatory, his chastisement will probably consist in reading over and over again Mr. Ruskin's 'Fors Clavigera' and the history of King Henry VIII. by Mr. Froude.

*Life and Letters of the Rev. John McClintock, D.D., LL.D.*, late President of Drew Theological Seminary. By George R. Crooks, D.D. (New York: Nelson & Phillips, 1876.)—Dr. McClintock was probably a "great" Methodist, but that he was a great man, considered from any other than a denominational point of view, his biography effectually disproves. Indeed, we have seldom, if ever, read a biographical work which made so little impression of any kind upon the mind. From his numerous letters and a mass of extracts from his diary we recall only two passages sufficiently aside from the commonplace to be remembered distinctly—one, which states that the works of Byron cannot live, that there are "no elements of durability, of immortality, about them"; and the other expressing his "deliberate opinion, and one not formed from theory or *a priori*, but from actual experience of colleges, that all the professors should be ministers of the Gospel, if possible." We recall, also, the fact that he could not feel comfortable in Paris because his friends there, although "kind and good," were not Methodists, and therefore not "the best sort" of people. But to the members of his denomination the biography of Dr. McClintock can hardly fail to be of some interest, on account of the numerous prominent positions which he held among them. Beginning as a book-keeper of the Methodist Book Concern, he became, at the age of 22, a professor in Dickinson College, where he remained nearly twelve years. He was then appointed editor of the *Methodist Quarterly Review*, which position he held several years, acting also during a portion of the same period as president of Troy University. Afterwards he became Chairman of the Centenary Committee, which did such effectual service in the raising of money a few years ago; and at the time of his death, which occurred in 1870, at the comparatively early age of 56, he was president of Drew Theological Seminary. He held, also, several church pastorates, including that of the American Chapel at Paris; and in this position only can it be said that the story of his life becomes of interest to the outside world, for while in Paris he was able to do some good service to the Union cause, by influencing public opinion in Europe at the time of the outbreak of our civil war. His literary works were unimportant, with the exception possibly of the initiation of the preparation of a 'Cyclopædia of Biblical, Theological, and Ecclesiastical Literature,' which remains, we believe, unfinished. His prominence in his denomination was due evidently not to the possession of unusual talents, but to the fact that he managed to secure a college education at a time when the Methodists had very few educated men in their ranks. Even this education, however, could not have been very thorough, as "four years of university training had been crowded into three, and one of these had been spent in preaching."

Dr. Crooks endeavors, so far as possible, to let Dr. McClintock tell the story of his own life by giving extracts from his diary and private letters; but although, as a rule, we should commend this method of writing biography, we cannot do so in the present instance. Dr. McClintock was a life-long sufferer from disease, brought on and confirmed by inattention to the laws of health, and his diary and letters are filled with dismal references to his physical and mental condition. Upon page after page we are told how he slept at night, how he felt in the morning, the condition of his throat, of his bowels, of his nerves, etc. In the first one hundred pages of the volume, we counted (hastily and with some omissions) no less than thirty-five of these dreary references by Dr. McClintock, in addition to many more

of the same kind by Dr. Crooks; and in some parts of the book the proportion would be greater than this. The list of diseases given, also, from constriction of the œsophagus to rheumatism and diarrhœa, seems almost long enough for a hospital record. Dr. Crooks might well have omitted nine-tenths of this valetudinary stuff, even if he had nothing better to put in its place than the names of the institutions which gave McClintock his doctorates.

*A Centennial Commissioner in Europe, 1874-75.* By J. W. Forney, Editor of the *Philadelphia Press*. (Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott & Co. 1876; pp. 403.)—This book is a collection of letters to the American public concerning five intermingled topics—viz., first, puffs of individuals, American politicians and others, chosen on grounds of selection known only to the writer: e. g., pages 137-140, which are devoted to one man, end with the words, "This rapid sketch is not a business notice of M. Bartholdi. He requires no such advertisement. His hands are full of orders." Secondly, "Paris is getting to be full of the Centennial. I am doing all I can to see that she comes over," etc. Thirdly, promiscuous descriptions, so carelessly culled that Col. Forney makes Liverpool contain 200,000 more people on page 331 than on page 14, and locates Manchester 180 miles west of London. Fourthly, narratives of miscellaneous events, such as Captain Boyton's swimming the Channel and Weston's walking. The last contains the following eulogy on a notorious character: "As we passed out of the great hall, and heard the band and the shouts of the honest crowds, I could not help asking a friend whether James Buchanan, while Minister to England, with his chilling white cravat, or Chas. Francis Adams, robed in his cold ancestral mantle, would have gone out like Robert C. Schenck"—to see Weston! Fifthly, fine moral sentiments, such as "a public trust is as sacred as a private trust," and others equally unsuggestive of Pacific Mail and Washington lobbyism and journalism. Col. Forney's style is vague and showy. Besides pretending to be a judge of the fine arts, he inserts several Latin phrases, two of which are incorrect—"stylî" instead of "styli," and "sine deo frustra," translated "unless God prevents"! He mistakes Francis II. for Francis I. as the King of France who was present at the Field of the Cloth of Gold. The only statements of the book in which its author speaks as an expert are those that concern the civil service, such as, "Nineteen years ago the Liverpool Consulate was worth four times its present value, which is \$6,000 per year" (p. 395).

\*. Publishers will confer a favor by always marking the price of their books on the wrapper.

## BOOKS OF THE WEEK.

Authors.—Titles.	Publishers.—Prices.
Etting (F. M.), Historical Account of the Old State-House of Pennsylvania. (J. R. Osgood & Co.)	5 00
Fleming (S.), The Intercolonial: a History, 1832-1876. (Dawson Bros.)	
Freeman (E. A.), Norman Conquest. Vol. V. (Macmillan & Co.)	4 00
Gardner (S. R.), First Two Stuarts and the Puritan Revolution. (D. Appleton & Co.)	
Gleig (Rev. G. R.), The Great Problem. (Scribner, Armstrong & Co.)	1 00
Globe Encyclopedia, Parts 1 and 2, swd. (Estes & Lauriat)	0 50
Hart (J. M.), Goethe: Ausgewählte Prosa. (G. P. Putnam's Sons)	1 01
Holland (J. G.), Every-day Topics. (Scribner, Armstrong & Co.)	1 75
Howard (J. Q.), Life of Rutherford B. Hayes, swd. (Boit, Clarke & Co.)	
Keyes (E. W.), History of Savings-Banks, Vol. I. (Bradford Rhodes)	
Klemm (L. R.), Lese- und Sprachbuch. (Henry Holt & Co.)	
Knight (R. P.), Symbolical Language of Ancient Art. (J. W. Bouton)	
Landrey (F.), Napoleon the First. Vol. III. (Macmillan & Co.)	3 50
Maritté (E.), At the Council-table: a Novel. (J. B. Lippincott & Co.)	
Masson (Rosaline O.), Three Centuries of English Poetry. (Macmillan & Co.)	1 50

## Wagner's Art Life and Theories.

Translated by Edward L. Burlingame. With Drawings of the Bayreuth Opera House. 12mo, \$2.

"Mr. Burlingame has performed a most useful task with great tact and taste. Not only interesting to all lovers of music, but entertaining, at least in some of its chapters, to the general reader."—*N. Y. Tribune*.

HENRY HOLT & CO., Publishers, N. Y.

## SCIENTIFIC FARMER.

Devoted to profitable Agriculture, which is the application of Science to the Farm. Sample copies, 10 cts. Subscription, \$1 a year. Address SCIENTIFIC FARMER CO., Boston, Mass.

## A Long-Needed Book.

"Double-Entry Book-keeping," as now practised in all leading houses, simply, briefly, and practically explained. The subject divested of all complication and difficulty.

Cloth \$1; boards, 75 cts. Sent post-paid. Catalogue free. D. B. WAGGENER & CO., 420 Walnut St., Philadelphia; Publishers of 'Waggener's Improved Trial-Balance Book.'

## BOOKS AT LONDON PRICES.

Now Ready: Catalogue No. 10 of Rare, Valuable, and Curious Books, free on application. JOHN EVANS, Importer, 194 Fulton St., Brooklyn, N.Y.

## NEW BOOKS.

## THE RACES OF MANKIND:

Being a Description of the Characteristics, Manners, and Customs of the Principal Varieties of the Human Family. By Robert Brown, M.A., Ph.D., F.L.S., F.R.G.S. Handsomely printed, and with over 500 illustrations, many full-page. 4 vols., cloth, \$14; or 2 vols., cloth, \$10.

Read what the London Bookseller says: "No work we are acquainted with conveys information respecting the different races inhabiting the world in a pleasanter or more instructive manner than this, and few works afford so much agreeable conversation in family circles."

## PROTESTANTISM.

## THE HISTORY OF PROTEST-

antism. By the Rev. J. A. Wylie, LL.D. Copiously illustrated, nearly 2,000 pages, to be completed in 3 vols. Vol. I. now ready. Price \$5.

This is the only complete history of Protestantism. Its want has long been felt, and Dr. Wylie is just the man to do the subject justice. Printed from new type, with many illustrations.

## NEW BOOKS

PUBLISHED BY W. P. NIMMO.

Sole Agents for United States: CASSELL, PETER & GALPIN

*THE SPECTATOR.* Complete in one volume. With Portrait of Addison, Notes, and a General Index. Royal 8vo, 918 pp., cloth extra, \$2 50.

*THE RAMBLER AND THE IDLER.* By Samuel Johnson, LL.D. *THE ADVENTURER.* By John Hawkesworth, LL.D. *THE CONNOISSEUR.* By Mr. Town, Critic and Censor-General. Complete in one volume. With Notes and Portrait of Dr. Johnson. Royal 8vo, 588 pp., cloth extra, \$2 50.

*THE HISTORY OF THE FRENCH* Revolution. By M. A. Thiers. Translated from the last Paris edition, with Notes. Royal 8vo, 972 pp., cloth extra, \$2 50.

*THE HISTORY OF THE CONSUMPTION* and the Empire of France under Napoleon. By M. A. Thiers. Translated from the last Paris edition, with Notes. Royal 8vo, 970 pp., cloth extra, \$2 50.

CASSELL, PETER & GALPIN,

596 Broadway, New York.

Send for Catalogues.



# MACMILLAN & Co.'s NEW PUBLICATIONS.

## THE HISTORY OF *The Norman Conquest of England:*

ITS CAUSES AND RESULTS.

By EDWARD A. FREEMAN, M.A., D.C.L.

*Revised American Edition, with all the Maps. Volume V., concluding the work. 8vo, gilt top, \$4. Volumes I. to V., 8vo, cloth, \$25.*

"By far the greatest history of our day."—*British Quarterly Review*.

"A perfect model of historical study."—*The Spectator*.

"His pages are as attractive as a novel, as brilliant as those of Thierry on the same subject, while he has produced a work more critical and philosophical than either Thierry or Palgrave."—*Chicago Tribune*.

"The early history of England is the early history of the American people—their religion, their language, and their laws."—*New York Times*.

"Holds the same relation to its subject as Gibbon's great work has long occupied in regard to the Declining Period of the Roman Empire."—*Cincinnati Gazette*.

## ELEMENTARY BIOLOGY.

*A Course of Practical Instruction.*

By T. H. HUXLEY, LL.D., ETC., Assisted by H. N. MARTIN, M.B.

*Second Revised Edition. Crown 8vo, cloth. (Ready.)*

## The History of Napoleon the First.

BY P. LANFREY.

A Translation made with the Sanction of the Author.

*Vol. III., 8vo, cloth, \$3 50. To be completed in four Volumes.*

### HISTORICAL AND ARCHITECTURAL SKETCHES,

Chiefly Italian. By Edward A. Freeman, D.C.L., LL.D. With Twenty-two Illustrations from Drawings by the author. Crown 8vo.

(Just ready)

### THE HISTORY AND CONQUESTS OF THE SARACENS.

Six Lectures delivered before the Edinburgh Philosophical Institution. By Edward A. Freeman, D.C.L., LL.D. Second edition, with New Preface. Crown 8vo.

(Just ready)

### SCIENCE PAPERS,

Chiefly Pharmacological and Botanical. By Daniel Hanbury, F.R.S. With Portrait and Illustrations. 8vo, \$6.

### EASTERN PERSIA:

An Account of the Journeys of the Persian Boundary Commission, 1870-72. The Geography, with Narratives by Majors St. John, Lovett, and Evan Smith; the Zoölogy and Geology by W. T. Blanford. With colored Illustrations. 2 vols. 8vo, \$18.

### A HISTORY OF ASIATIC CHOLERA.

By C. Macnamara, F.C.U. Crown 8vo, \$4.

### CHOLERA EPIDEMICS IN EAST AFRICA.

By James Christie, A.M., M.D. With Maps. 8vo, \$6.

MACMILLAN & CO., 21 Astor Place, New York.

## Schools.

(Continued from page 10.)

MASS., Cambridgeport, 123 Human Street.  
**DAY AND FAMILY SCHOOL** to fit Young Men for Harvard. JEROME KENDALL.

MASS., Gt. Barrington, Berkshire Co.  
**FAMILY SCHOOL FOR BOYS.** James RICH, A.M., Principal.

MASSACHUSETTS, Greenfield.  
**PROSPECT HILL SCHOOL.** Miss SABRA WRIGHT, Principal. Send for circular.

MASS., Hadley, Hampshire Co.  
**ELMWOOD HOME**—Misses Porter & Champney's family school for young ladies and children.

MASSACHUSETTS, Mohon.  
**A HOME, with suitable care and instruction,** for six boys or students. Rev. J. TENTS.

MASSACHUSETTS, Newton Centre.  
**HOMER SCHOOL FOR GIRLS.**—Maternal care and culture, with English, Modern and Ancient Languages; also, Music and Drawing. Address Mrs. M. C. BROWN.

MASSACHUSETTS, Pittsfield.  
**ENGLISH AND FRENCH SCHOOL** for Boys. The school year opens Wednesday, Sept. 25. JARED REID, Jr., A.M. JAMES VAUGHAN, A.M.

MASSACHUSETTS, Pittsfield.  
**MAPLEWOOD INSTITUTE** for Young Ladies. Thirty-five years old. Excellence of its present advantages never surpassed; beauty of its grounds and buildings never equalled. Address Rev. C. V. SPEAR, the Principal, for circulars.

MASSACHUSETTS, Plymouth.  
**MR. KNAPP'S HOME SCHOOL** for Boys. Next (tenth) school year begins Wednesday, Sept. 20.

MASSACHUSETTS, Quincy.  
**ADAMS ACADEMY.**—Hon. Charles Francis Adams, LL.D., Chairman of the Board of Managers; William R. Dimmock, LL.D., Master. Designed to give the most thorough preparation for college. There is also a preparatory class for those too young, or not sufficiently advanced for admission to the Academy. The Master and Assistant Teachers reside in the Academy boarding-house. For rooms in this for the next school year, early application should be made. For catalogues, address the MASTER.

MASSACHUSETTS, Stockbridge.  
**BOYS AND YOUNG MEN** privately fitted for College. Conditioned or rejected candidates coached. Stockbridge, Mass. F. ROFFMAN.

MASSACHUSETTS, Walham.  
**WILHAM NEW-CHURCH SCHOOL.** Seventeenth year begins Sept. 20. Good home and thorough instruction for boys and girls of all ages. Boys fitted for Harvard. BENJ. WORCESTER, Principal.

MASSACHUSETTS, West Newton.  
**ENGLISH AND CLASSICAL SCHOOL.** A Family and Day School for both Sexes. NATHL. T. ALLEN, Principal.

MASS., Fouth Williamstown, Berkshire Co.  
**GREYLOCK INSTITUTE.** A first-class Preparatory School. Terms \$450 per year. For catalogues address BENJ. F. MILLS, A.M., Principal.

MASSACHUSETTS, Worcester.  
**HIGHLAND MILITARY ACADEMY.** C. B. METCALF, A.M., Supt.

MASSACHUSETTS, Worcester.  
**OREAD INSTITUTE** for Young Ladies. Founded 1848. Address H. R. GREENE, at Newport, R. I., until September 8.

MASSACHUSETTS, Worcester.  
**SELECT FAMILY AND DAY SCHOOL** for Young Ladies, Worcester, Mass. Miss AYA WILLIAMS.

MASSACHUSETTS, Worcester.  
**WORCESTER FREE INST. of Industrial Science.**—Address Prof. C. O. THOMPSON.

MICHIGAN, Ann Arbor.  
**UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN, School of Mines.** Second year opens Sept. 27, 1876. Complete courses in Mining, Metallurgy, Chemistry, and kindred subjects. Also in Architecture. Address H. D. BENNETT, Steward.

MINNESOTA, Northfield.  
**CARLETON COLLEGE** Open to both sexes. J. W. SFRONO, D.D., President.

MISSOURI, St. Louis, 3d Street.  
**ST. LOUIS LAW SCHOOL.** Term will open October 1, 1876. Address GEORGE M. STEWART, Dean.

NEW HAMPSHIRE, Hanover.  
**CHANDLER SCIENTIFIC DEPARTMENT** of Dartmouth College. Liberal education on a scientific basis. Specialty, Civil Engineering. Address Prof. RUGGLES.

NEW HAMPSHIRE, Portsmouth.  
**MISS MORGAN'S English, French, and German** Boarding School for Young Ladies.

NEW JERSEY, Bordentown.  
**BORDENTOWN FEMALE COLLEGE.** Select, thorough, Christian; delightful situation, and very healthy. Rev. WM. C. BOWEN, A.M., Pres.

NEW JERSEY, Bound Brook.  
**BOUND BROOK INSTITUTE.** Tuition Free to Sons and Daughters of Clergymen, and to Young Men preparing for the Ministry. Address Rev. A. O. HARRISON, A.M., Principal.

NEW JERSEY, Burlington.  
**ST. MARY'S HALL.**—For admission or circular, address the Rev. E. K. SMITH, Principal.

NEW JERSEY, Elizabeth.  
**MISS KANNEY'S BOARDING AND DAY SCHOOL** for Young Ladies will be reopened on Wednesday, October 1.

NEW JERSEY, Ivy Hall.  
**MRS. M. C. SHEPPARD,** having resumed the charge of Ivy Hall, offers to a few young ladies the advantages of a sound education, with the culture of a Christian home and the privileges and refinements of family life. Sept. 11, 1876.

NEW JERSEY, Jamesburg.  
**AT THE JAMESBURG INSTITUTE** care is given to each boy's disposition and need. \$4 per quarter, and no extras. Address M. OAKLEY, A.M., Prin.

NEW JERSEY, New Brunswick.  
**MRS. PARKS'S SEMINARY** for Young Ladies reopens Sept. 20. Twelve family pupils admitted.

NEW YORK, Albany.  
**ALBANY ACADEMY** for Boys and Young Men. Established 1813. Fits thoroughly for Yale and Harvard. For six years no graduate has been conditioned in Latin or Greek at any college. Honorable entrances at Harvard; high honors at Yale this year; and Porter Prize for best preparation at Amherst. Fits for intelligent business life by an advanced course in English Literature, Mathematics (thorough analytics of Conic Sections), History, Natural Sciences, French (French Text-books in Physics), or German. Small boarding department; board, \$20 to \$25 per quarter (10 weeks). Two boys will be received into the Principal's family on special terms. Address MERRILL EDWARDS GATES, A.M., Principal.

NEW YORK, Albany.  
**ENGLISH, FRENCH, AND CLASSICAL INSTITUTE.** A Boarding and Day School for Young Ladies. Course of study full. French spoken in the family. For circulars, address either of the Principals. MRS. C. A. COMMETTE, Miss LUCY A. PLYMPTON, Mad. J. A. COMMETTE, 183 North Pearl Street.

NEW YORK, Albany.  
**ST. AGNES' SCHOOL,** under direction of Rt. Rev. W. C. Doane. Circulars sent on application.

NEW YORK, Aurora, Cayuga Lake.  
**WELLS COLLEGE** for YOUNG LADIES. Full Collegiate Course. Location unsurpassed for beauty and healthfulness. Term commences 13th Sept., 1876. Send for catalogue. Rev. EDWARD S. FRISBEE, Pres.

NEW YORK, Batavia.  
**MRS. W. G. BRYAN'S** Boarding-School for Young Ladies.

NEW YORK, Cazenovia.  
**CAZENOVIA SEMINARY.** Established 1825. Has prepared over 600 young men for college. Address Rev. W. S. SMYTH, Principal.

NEW YORK CITY, 113 Sixth Ave.  
**A CLASS FOR BOYS.**—The design of this Class is to prepare boys for the best colleges in the most thorough manner. Number of pupils limited to twelve. References: President Eliot, Harvard University; Theodore Roosevelt, Esq., and William H. Osborn, Esq., New York City. Class opens Sept. 26. For circulars apply on Mondays, Wednesdays, and Fridays to ARTHUR H. CUTLER.

NEW YORK CITY.  
**A. GODEFRIN,** Teacher of French (formerly of Boston, address Natchon office). Single pupils and conversation classes.

NEW YORK CITY, 101 West 4th St., cor. 6th Ave.  
**DR. F. SACHS' COLLEGIATE INSTITUTE** reopens Sept. 13. Thorough course of Classical, English, and German instruction.

NEW YORK CITY, Central Park.  
**CHARLIER INSTITUTE** for Boys and Young Gentlemen of 7 to 20 years. Boarding and Day School. College, Business, West Point, and Scientific Schools. French, German, and Spanish carefully taught and spoken. Building new; the best of its kind. Twenty-second year begins Sept. 18. Prof. ELIE CHARLIER, Director.

NEW YORK CITY, 167 Madison Avenue.  
**CHARLIER INSTITUTE** for Young Ladies will reopen September 26. A few boarders will be taken. Pupils prepared for the Harvard Examinations for Women. Circulars can be had on application, or at Putnam's. Miss. SOPHIE LENZ and Professor M. J. DRENNAN, Principals.

NEW YORK CITY, 8 Great Jones Street.  
**COLUMBIA COLLEGE LAW SCHOOL.**—The nineteenth annual term of this institution will commence on Wednesday, October 4, and will continue until May 17, 1877. Catalogues containing full information may be obtained by personal application at No. 8 Great Jones Street, or by letter addressed at the same number to THADDEUS W. DWIGHT, Professor, etc.

NEW YORK CITY.  
**DUANE S. EVERSON'S Collegiate School.** Harvard Rooms, cor. 42d St. and 6th Ave.

NEW YORK CITY.  
**F. H. MORSE'S SCHOOL,** 127 Broadway, reopens Sept. 25. Prepares for Harvard, Yale, etc.

NEW YORK CITY.  
**LAW SCHOOL** of the University of the City of New York. The eighteenth annual session begins Oct. 2, 1876. For circulars, last examination papers, etc., apply to W. R. MARTIN, Sec'y of Council, 111 Broadway, or B. R. JAGGERS, Sec'y of Faculty, 25 Chambers Street.

NEW YORK CITY, 9 West 33rd St.  
**MISS ANNA C. BRACKETT AND MISS Ida M. Elliot** will reopen their Home and Day School for Girls on Tuesday, Oct. 3. Circulars sent on application.

NEW YORK CITY, 32 and 34 West 4th St., facing Reservoir Park.  
**MISS COMSTOCK'S** Boarding and Day School. Resident French and German governesses. Boarding pupils limited to sixteen. Private class of boys. Kindergarten. Aims in teaching: thoroughness and capacity for self-culture.

NEW YORK CITY, 10 Gramercy Park.  
**MISS HAINES and Mlle. de JANON'S** School for Young Ladies and Children will reopen on Thursday, Sept. 28. A punctual attendance of their pupils is respectfully requested.

Miss Haines and Mlle. de Janon respectfully announce that they will continue, under skilful teachers, their experiment of a Kindergarten, with an intermediate class for Boys and Girls, who will be taught in addition to read and write. Also, a Class for Boys only, for thorough elementary instruction. All applications to be made at 10 Gramercy Park, for Oct. 2, 1876.

NEW YORK CITY, 32 E. 31st Street.  
**MISS JACDON'S YOUNG LADIES' Eng-**lish, French, and German Boarding and Day School and Kindergarten will reopen Thursday, Sept. 28. Kindergarten pupils limited to 30; boarding scholars to 6.

NEW YORK CITY.  
**MME. VE BRASIER de la VAUGUYON** will open a Course of Drawing and Painting in New York, October 9, 1876. For terms, address Mme. BRASIER Studio, 7 Gramercy Park.

NEW YORK CITY, 7 East 43d Street.  
**MRS. J. T. BENEDICT'S BOARDING** and Day School for Young Ladies and Children. Will open Sept. 28.

NEW YORK CITY, 68 West 36th St.  
**MRS. JULIA W. GAFFEN'S DAY-**School for Young Ladies and Children will reopen Sept. 28.

NEW YORK CITY, 48 Madison Avenue.  
**MR. MARLBOROUGH CHURCHILL, Fev.** MYTON MURRY, D.D. School for boys. Preparation for College, Scientific Schools, or business. Term begins Sept. 13, 1876. Hours of session 9:30-2:30. Hour for study only (v. literary), teachers present to assist, 8:30 to 9:30.

NEW YORK CITY, 69 East 61st St.  
**MRS. HERMANN ROEBBELEN'S** Boarding and Day School for Young Ladies and Children. Primary Department for Boys. Thorough instruction in English, French, and German. The school opens Sept. 20. Mrs. Roebbelen will be at home after Sept. 4. Oral lessons in languages in Primary department.

NEW YORK CITY, 30 East 33rd Street.  
**MISS PEGRAM'S CLASSES** for Young Ladies and Children will be resumed the 23d of Sept. A few boarding-pupils received. Circulars may be obtained at 178 Madison Avenue.

NEW YORK CITY, 148 Madison Ave.  
**MRS. ROBERTS AND MISS WALKER'S** School for Young Ladies reopens Sept. 25. Three young ladies will be received into the family.

NEW YORK CITY, 6 and 8 East 13d Street.  
**MRS. SYLVANUS REED'S BOARDING** and Day School for Young Ladies reopens October 1. French and German languages practically taught. Thorough training in Primary and Preparatory Departments. The course of study in the collegiate department meets all the requirements for the higher education of women. A successful kindergarten is connected with the school.

NEW YORK CITY.  
**NEW YORK HOMOEOPATHIC MEDICAL** College. For information, address J. W. DOWLING, M.D., Dean, 583 Fifth Avenue, New York.

NEW YORK CITY, 1266 and 1268 Broadway.  
**NEW YORK NORMAL TRAINING** School (with Model Kindergarten) for Kindergarten teachers reopens November 2. Mrs. KRAUS-BOELTE, Principals. Prof. JOHN KRAUS, Principal.

NEW YORK CITY, 6 E. 20th St., bet. Broadway and Fifth Avenue.  
**N. Y. NORMAL CONSERVATORY OF** Music. No classes. Private lessons only. Special features: For beginners, unusual thoroughness; for advanced pupils, finish and style. S. A. GERLACH, Director.

NEW YORK CITY, 457, 459, and 491 Fifth Avenue.  
**RUTGERS FEMALE COLLEGE.** Opens Sept. 27. Examinations Sept. 25 and 26. Send for circular. Rev. THOS. D. ANDERSON, D.D., President.

NEW YORK CITY, 8 E. 46th Street.  
**S. MARY'S SCHOOL** (Episcopal), under the charge of the Sisters of S. Mary. The ninth year will begin Sept. 21. Apply to the SISTER SUPERIOR.



